

INSTITUTTET
FOR SAMMENLIGNENDE KULTURFORSKNING

LATE LATIN

BY
EINAR LÖFSTEDT

OSLO 1959

H. ASCHERHOU & CO. (W. NYGAARD)

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH
TRUBNER & CO., LTD.

WIESBADEN
OTTO HARRASSOWITZ

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PARIS
SOCIÉTÉ D'ÉDITION
«LES BELLES LETTRES»

P R E F A C E

In 1937 the Board of The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture decided to arrange a series of lectures dealing with the Migration period (400—800 A.D.) extending over several years. Because of the war, the execution of the project had to be postponed until 1946. In connection with the lectures on the philosophical and linguistic aspects of the period in question, Professor Einar Löfstedt of Lund University, Sweden, was invited to give a series of lectures at this Institute in 1951, on Late Latin. The state of his health prevented him, however, from delivering the lectures, but he agreed most kindly to the Institute's proposal to have them published. Professor Löfstedt worked on the manuscript until his death in 1955. Considering the care with which the famous scholar prepared the publication of all his contributions to classical philology, it was not without apprehension that the Institute accepted the responsibility of publishing the present work without the author's cooperation. We extend out most sincere thanks to Dr. James Willis who has undertaken the translation of the book into English from the Swedish manuscript, and to Mr. Vegard Skånland, M.A., who has been in charge of the proofreading, to Mrs. Löfstedt, Professor Harald Hagendahl, and to Mrs. T. B. L. Webster, for assistance and advice. We hope that the results of our efforts will not be judged unworthy of the great scholar whose death was so deeply felt in the learned world.

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	v
CONTENTS	vii
 CH. I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS	 1
CH. II. LATE LATIN, VULGAR LATIN, ROMANCE	11
CH. III. LOCAL VARIATION IN LATIN	39
CH. IV. MEDIEVAL LATIN	59
CH. V. THE CHRISTIAN INFLUENCE	68
CH. VI. THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK	88
CH. VII. SOME CHANGES IN THE NOMINAL SYSTEM	120
CH. VIII. CHANGES IN THE MEANING OF WORDS	143
CH. IX. SOME PREPOSITIONS AND PARTICLES	163
CH. X. TABOO, EUPHEMISM, AND PRIMITIVE CONCEPTIONS IN LANGUAGE	181
 LITERATURE	 195
INDICES	
1. Index rerum	202
2. Index verborum	203
Latin, Romance, Greek	
3. Index locorum	209

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

To give within a few short chapters any adequate or lively characterization of what is commonly called Late Latin, is no easy task. One great difficulty arises from the disparate levels of achievement in late Roman literature, embracing as it does works of permanent value and wretched compilations — the Confessions of Augustine and the *Mulomedicina Chironis*, the *Corpus Juris Civilis* and the chronicles of Jordanes, the finest of Prudentius' hymns together with the artless, often moving, sometimes scarcely intelligible verses in which workmen, soldiers, and freedmen from all corners of the empire strove towards self-expression. To bring all these literary or subliterary creations, within the ambit of a single definition is barely possible.

It is no less difficult, and perhaps more important from the historical standpoint, to determine when Late Latin begins and ends. In literature the great Roman tradition ends with Tacitus. Apuleius, born about 125, is already the representative of a different style: shifting, iridescent, borrowing freely from poetry, deliberately archaizing, strongly influenced by Greek and, in the *Metamorphoses*, by the realistic narrative style of the prose romance, from which it draws certain popular elements of its language. Whether we are to make Late Latin start with Apuleius, Gellius, and Fronto, or — perhaps more plausibly — to refer it to the age of Tertullian and the earliest martyrologies, that is, around or shortly before 200, is a question of terminology rather than of substance. In the world of language there are no sudden transitions; the aphorism of COLLINGWOOD cuts as sharply here as elsewhere: "There are in history no beginnings and no endings. History books begin and end, but the events they describe do not."

This "salutary warning," as it has been called,¹ deserves to be borne in mind particularly when considering the much-disputed and difficult question, when Late Latin came to an end, that is to say, when Latin ceased to be in any real sense a living language, and the Romance languages began. That this development was gradual and very slow is at once apparent, and therefore it is not possible to draw a sharp dividing line, but only an approximation to one. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, taking as its object a comprehensive presentation — as far as may be — of the great mass of Latin literature, in general concerns itself only with authors and documents up to about 600. From a practical viewpoint this procedure seems perfectly appropriate, provided that the fact is never lost from sight, that especially in the popular living language, but up to a point in the literary style also, strong Romance tendencies and elements can be detected long before this date and must be assumed to have existed in even greater quantity. On the other hand it is no less certainly established that even in the great mass of texts, letters, laws, and other documents from the period later than 600, by the side of Romanisms, barbarisms, and pure blunders there occur widely distributed peculiarities of idiom that are of interest from the purely Latin point of view, particularly — though by no means exclusively — for the study of Vulgar Latin. "Was nun (i. e. after the sixth century) in Urkunden, Texten und Inschriften begegnet," says ROHLFS,² "ist weniger Vulgärlatein als Latinisierung romanischer Vulgärsprache." Certainly this is true in many cases, although to my mind it is somewhat overstated. In general the rule enunciated by NORBERG is valid,³ when in speaking of the Merovingian period in Gaul, which is particularly well documented, he observes that before 600 the popular speech may be called Latin, after 800 Romance. For the intervening period either name will serve, provided that we bear in mind the fact that no firm frontier in time separates spoken Latin from the earliest Romance idiom. Particular problems must of course be left for consideration when their turn comes.

Concerning the language of the Merovingian documents many diverse theories have been proposed. According to some American scholars — H. F. MULLER and his school — it will have been more or less identical with the

¹ BAYNES and MOSS, *Byzantium* (Oxford 1948), *Introd.*, p. xv.

² GERHARD ROHLFS, *Romanische Philologie* (Heidelberg 1950) I, p. 18.

³ *Synt. Forsch.*, p. 21. On the development in Gaul cf. also VON WARTBURG, *Einführung*, p. 178, 190; and the same author's *Évolution et structure de la langue française* (Leipzig-Berlin 1934), pp. 21 ff.

contemporary spoken language. PEI (p. 357) calls it a transitional tongue, a notion which he goes on to clarify thus: "a tongue in which there is still a subconscious conflict of tendencies, a struggle on the part of the old order to save and retain the wreckage of what was once classical Latin, against the new, inarticulate, but triumphant tendencies which assert themselves more and more as time goes on; but a tongue which bears every mark of being not merely written, but spoken as well, and spoken not by an intellectual *élite* alone, but by the vast mass of the population."

This last position cannot be maintained. As NORBERG¹ points out, it is a priori unlikely that a Gallic peasant of the eighth century should have spoken almost the same language as that used by a royal secretary in drafting his master's edicts and diplomas. There could be no sharper contrast than that between the conservative character of officialdom's language and the tendencies of popular speech. Merovingian Latin is in fact a haphazard mixture, in which by the side of legal formulae and more or less correct constructions on the old models we find out-and-out vulgarisms and frequent deviations from classical standards.² Many of these may be set aside as pure blunders of no real interest, but a large number undoubtedly arise from the living language of the people, and give us many valuable glimpses of its nature and development.

So far as concerns the written language, this vulgarizing tendency was checked by the reforms of Pippin and Charlemagne — the so-called Carolingian Renaissance — about the middle of the eighth century, which aimed at a return to the classical rules, and especially in spelling and morphology brought about great changes.³ Some illuminating examples are given by PEI pp. 364 ff.,

¹ Op. cit., p. 17 (with interesting examples from various documents).

² Loan words add a further element. Cf., e. g., STRECKER — VAN DE WOSTIJNE p. 18: "Bientôt des mots d'origine celtique et germanique, empruntés notamment au vocabulaire judiciaire et militaire, s'introduisent dans la langue (par exemple: *bannus*, *bannire*, *commarcanus*, *markmanni*, *faida*, *feida*, *feidosus*, *feodum*, *infeodare*, *werra*, *gerra*, *guerra*, etc.); plus tard, dès qu'elles furent complètement développées, les langues romanes exercèrent à leur tour une certaine influence sur le latin médiéval (*parenti*, *-orum*; *excriatus*, cf. *écrier*)." See further MEYER-LÜBKE, *Einführung*, pp. 43 ff.; on similar influences in earlier Vulgar Latin see J. BRÜCH, *Der Einfluss der germanischen Sprachen auf das Vulgärlatein* (Heidelberg 1913).

³ For literature on the Carolingian Renaissance, a period of great importance also for literature and history in general, see STRECKER — VAN DE WOESTIJNE p. 19; KIRN in *Arch. f. Urkundenforsch.* X, pp. 128 ff.

in the form of a comparison between two groups of diplomas, of roughly equal extent, the one dating from 700–717, the other from 750–770. Differences in phonology and morphology — less frequently in syntax¹ — are very interesting. PEI notes that accented long *e* becomes *i* 175 times in the former group, in the latter only 37 times. Similarly accented long *o* becomes *u* 30 times in the former group, only 12 times in the latter. The vulgar use of *suus* for *eius*, which is so important for the development of the Romance languages, occurs 21 times in the former group, but no more than 6 times in the latter.

Very instructive also is PEI's comparison (p. 387 and Introd. p. 8) between two documents from 716 and 768 respectively (TARDIF 46 and 61). The latter is in essentials a straightforward transcript of the other, with the most obvious blunders in phonology and sometimes in morphology corrected. For example, the first exhibits such forms as *illut que*, *adescibetur*, *ad aejectum*, *inpertemus*, *habyre meriamur*, *pristetirunt*, *ipsius monastiriae*, *estabilitate*, etc., which in the second are corrected to *illud quod*, *adscribitur*, *ad effectum*, *impertimur*, *habere mereamur*, *praestiterunt*, *ipsius monasterii*, *stabilitate*, etc. The tendency to reduce at least the outward form of the written language to the classical norm is at once apparent.

It is clear that in the period of this reform the cleavage between the spoken and the written language had become important, and that these differences grew with time until at last the great mass of the people no longer understood literary Latin. The most striking testimony to this state of affairs is the well-known decision of the Council of Tours in 813: *visum est unanimitati nostrae, ut quilibet episcopus ... omelias (i. e. homilias) ... aperte transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam aut Thiotiscam, quo facilius cuncti possint intellegere quae dicuntur*.² This record, to apply the expression of VON WARTBURG (Einführung p. 191), is as it were the birth certificate of the national languages of Europe. In view of the conservative character of the official and especially the ecclesiastical language we may take it for granted that the linguistic conditions here implied were of considerably earlier date than the Council of Tours. Less than thirty years afterwards the well-known 'serments de Strasbourg' of 842 exemplify the *rustica Romana lingua* in an almost pure Romance (Old French) form.

¹ In most cases the syntax, according to PEI p. 8, "continues to remain corrupt. In fact the syntactical corruption increases as time goes on." Cf. also NORBERG, op. cit., p. 13.

² MGH, Leg. sect. III : 2, p. 288, 24 ff.

Considerations of space prevent this short survey from dealing in detail with the developments in Spain and Italy. In the former country, which was colonized early, the Roman inhabitants probably spoke, as MEYER-LÜBKE suggests (Einführung p. 18), a rather older Latin than the colonists in Gaul. In the main the Latin of the Iberian peninsula, like that of Dacia, seems to have been of a conservative and traditionary character.¹ Hence it is, as has often been noticed, that of two or more synonymous expressions it is the older, more refined, or less popular that is found in Spain. A well-known example is furnished by the periphrastic forms of comparatives: in Gaul and Italy the later and more vulgar *plus* wins the day, but in Spanish and Portuguese, as also in Rumanian, the classical *magis* prevails.² (Another characteristic example is given below p. 41).

Of basic importance for the historical study of Spanish is the celebrated work of R. MENÉNDEZ PIDAL: *Orígenes del Español*,³ with its comprehensive research into linguistic history and geography. The author also gives a critical edition of several interesting texts and documents from the tenth and eleventh centuries. Nevertheless there are many details in the linguistic phenomena which have yet to be fully understood, partly because there are very few vulgar texts of early date,⁴ partly through the shortage of critical editions of such as exist. It is only recently that scholars in Spain and elsewhere have begun with great energy and success to examine closely the oldest materials for the history of the Iberian Romance languages. Two useful, although somewhat over-schematic and not always critical American dissertations may be mentioned: A. C. JENNINGS, *A Linguistic Study of the Cartulario de San Vincente de Oviedo* (New York 1940), and N. P. SACKS, *The Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory* (Philadelphia 1941). Of greater interest,

¹ Cf. DEVOTO p. 299 (with further references particularly to the researches of BARTOLI); VON WARTBURG, ZRPh LXI, 147; LERCH in *Handbuch der Spanienkunde* (Frankfurt 1932), pp. 148 f., with references to GRÖBER, JUD, and others, who emphasize the relatively early romanizing of the country and its geographical separation, etc. SOFER (Die Sprache, II: 1, 1950, p. 32) refers to the old Iberian and modern Spanish-Portuguese national character of pride and conservatism, but the picture given by LERCH is less stereotyped and better supported (realism, impulsiveness, imagination, modesty, etc.).

² For particulars see, e. g., MEYER-LÜBKE II § 65.

³ 1. ed., 1926; 3. ed. (revised and expanded), Madrid 1950.

⁴ Cf. NORBERG, Synt. Forsch. p. 24: "Ueberhaupt: kenne ich keine vulgärsprachlichen Texte aus Spanien aus der Zeit vor 711, als die Araber das westgotische Königreich zerstörten."

especially from a Latinist's viewpoint, is J. N. GARVIN's extensive work on the *Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium*, a hagiographical text of the seventh century, edited with translation, detailed introduction, and useful commentary (Diss. Washington 1946). A substantial contribution is made also by the work of the young Spanish philologist JUAN BASTARDAS PARERA, *Particularidades sintacticas del latin medieval* (Barcelona 1953). This is a thorough and methodical study of Spanish documents from the eighth to the eleventh century, and achieves many fruitful results.¹ Of the greatest importance, though principally so for Romance studies, is the epoch-making collection *Leges Hispanicae Medii Aevi*, ed. by G. TILANDER (vol. I-VI, Stockholm 1950-56).

In Italy Latin maintained itself longer than in any other Romance country, certainly for two, perhaps for three centuries after 600. In fact there is no clear indication before the end of the tenth century that the spoken differed from the written language, although the gap between the two must have been noticeable much earlier. Our specimens of Old Italian go no further back than this time, that is the second half of the tenth century.² To advance our knowledge of Latin in Italy during this long transitional period much remains to be done, and we have at our command a large number of important documents in good critical editions, which have hitherto been neglected or at least inadequately studied. Many such texts are published in the great series *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, of which vol. I appeared in 1887 and vol. XC in 1946. Among these may be mentioned, e.g., *Codice Diplomatico Longobardo*, ed. L. SCHIAPARELLI (1929, 1933); *Chronicon Vulturnense* del monaco Giovanni, ed. V. FEDERICI (1925, 1940); *Codice Diplomatico del monastero di San Colombano di Bobbio*, edd. C. CIPOLLA and G. BUZZI (1918).³ Another collection of documents is the *Monumenta ad Neapolitani Ducatus historiam pertinentia*, ed. B. CAPASSO (Naples 1881-1892). Further editions of similar documents are, e.g., *Codice Diplomatico Toscano*, ed. F. BRUNETTI (Florence 1806 ff.), listed by ROHLFS, *Rom. Phil.* II 25. Some of the most important Lombard laws, e.g., *Edictus Rothari* (643) and *Liutprandi Leges* (713-735), are published

¹ Short samples of historical texts from the eighth to the thirteenth century are given by LUIS VAZQUEZ DE PARGA, *Textos históricos en latin medieval* (Madrid 1952).

² Cf. GRANDGENT, *From Latin to Italian* (1926), p. 9; E. MONACI, *Crestomazia Italiana dei primi secoli* (1912), pp. 2 f.; NORBERG, *op. cit.* p. 23.

³ Another series, *Monumenti storici pubblicati dalla R. Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie*, contains *Codice Diplomatico Veronese*, ed. V. FAINELLI (1940); the contents are documents from 501-887.

by BLUHME in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Legum* tom. IV (1868), and other texts, such as Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* and the *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis* of Agnellus,¹ are edited by WAITZ and HOLDER-EGGER in another volume of the series.²

To give a clear or even a summary characterization of the language in all these diverse monuments is impossible. Just as in Merovingian Latin, so here we see a strange mixture of old and new linguistic elements, of correct and incorrect constructions, of classical reminiscences and startling vulgarisms. Perhaps the contrasts are even greater in Italy than elsewhere: certainly there is an enormous gulf, e.g., between the early papal letters and the vulgarizing, sometimes quite barbarous language of the Lombard laws. The first and foremost need is a number of special studies on these documents and others.³ But even now it seems possible out of the linguistic confusion of these documents to bring out many interesting features capable of throwing light upon the growth of the living language. In these cases the necessary control is derived on one side from a basic knowledge of the earlier stages of Latin, on the other from constant reference to the Romance development. Examples will be given later.

These short preliminary observations on the linguistic development in a few areas of particular importance are all that can be given here. For the purposes of this work it is not necessary to treat in detail every part of the Romance-speaking world.⁴ The intimate connexion between Late Latin in the

¹ On the language of Agnellus cf. J. BRILL, *Der Liber Pontificalis des Agnellus von Ravenna* (Diss. Münster 1933).

² *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI-IX* (1878).

³ A work of this kind is R. L. POLITZER, *A Study of the Language of the Eighth Century Lombardic Documents* (Diss. Columbia University 1949), in the main a statistical analysis of the *Codice Paleografico Lombardo*; conclusion and summary pp. 135 ff. and 148 ff. I have not had access to K. M. FISCHER, *A Study of the Lombard Laws* (Diss. Cornell Univ. 1950).

⁴ On the differentiation of the Romance languages and its causes, ethnic, linguistic, historical, and social, see, e.g., MEYER-LÜBKE, *Einführung* pp. 18 ff.; further VON WARTBURG, *Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker* (2. ed., 1951), pp. 39-53. This is the most important survey; see his references p. 189. Also J. SOFER in *Die Sprache*, II : 1 (1950), pp. 23-38 (less important). Rather antiquated, but still valuable are the very comprehensive special studies in G. GRÖBER's well-known *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, I (2. ed., 1904-1906): of general interest are especially W. MEYER-LÜBKE, *Die lateinische Sprache in den romanischen Ländern*, pp. 451-497, and G. GRÖBER, *Die romanischen Sprachen. Ihre Einteilung und äussere Geschichte*, pp. 535-563.

usual sense of the word and early Medieval Latin is in any case clear.¹ Where we are to draw the line between them is a problem of only secondary importance. Closely related and to some degree identical is the much debated question, when Roman ancient history ends and the Middle Ages begin. For a discussion of this, which is after all a problem for historians, I refer the reader to, e.g., F. LOT in 'Histoire du Moyen Age' I, pp. 1 f.² In common with many other, especially French scholars, he chooses as the most appropriate boundary the death of Theodosius in 395; others prefer 476 with the deposition of the last emperor in the west;³ some bring it down to the death of Justinian in 565 or even later.⁴ "In truth . . . there is no point between Augustus and Charlemagne where we can say, The old is finished, the new not yet begun. Choose where we will, medieval elements are traceable before it, ancient elements after it" (GWATKIN in Cambridge Medieval History I, pp. 1 f.). This rather sceptical dictum is certainly true, in my opinion, for the period after Constantine.

The same holds good, as I briefly indicated above (p. 2), for the problem as viewed linguistically. Here also there are conflicting opinions. DEVOTO (*Storia della lingua di Roma*, p. 347) declares that obviously a definite division cannot be made, and rightly observes that the facts present themselves differently in respect to the written and the spoken languages, but he nevertheless ends by giving it as his opinion that from the viewpoint of linguistic history only one date and one event can be thought of as a dividing line — the year 476 and the fall of the Western Empire. To me, however, this

¹ Cf. below pp. 60; 62.

² In the *Histoire Générale* of G. GLOTZ. Treated in more detail by Kr. HANELL, *Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund, Årsbok* 1939, pp. 3 ff.

³ So SEECK in his *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. VI, pp. 379 f.

⁴ I quote, *honoris causa*, the following passage from the distinguished philologist and historian RAMÓN MENÉNDEZ PIDAL: "Although the modern method of dividing History into three ages, instead of six as formerly, may tend to simplicity, it is of but little use to us when we attempt to co-ordinate the events that fall to be chronicled in a history that pretends to be universal. Nevertheless, for lack of a better term we employ that of the Middle Ages here to denote the period from the eighth to the fifteenth century" (*The Cid and his Spain*, London 1934, p. 16). A quite different opinion is expressed by another authority on early medieval history, N. H. BAYNES, who sees in the reign of Constantine the turning point in Roman history, "The first Christian emperor was, indeed, as Ammianus described him, a 'turbator rerum', a revolutionary. Constantine sitting amongst the Christian bishops at the oecumenical council of Nicaea is in his own person the beginning of Europe's Middle Age" (*Cambridge Ancient History* XII, p. 699).

opinion seems to be based more on considerations of history and politics than on any linguistic reason. As far as the language is concerned, the decisive change took place somewhat later, at the close of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century, or briefly, about 600. At this period began, so far as I can see, the manifest vulgarizing of Latin, particularly in Italy. Even on historical grounds something may be said for this view. In 568 Italy was invaded by the Lombards, an event of the most revolutionary importance.¹ "Der Staat der Langobarden," writes STREHL,² "leitet die Geschichte des italischen Mittelalters ein." Similarly PEISKER (*Cambridge Medieval History* II, p. 436), and above all A. v. GUTSCHMID's brilliant study 'Die Grenze zwischen Altertum und Mittelalter' (*Kleine Schriften* V, pp. 393 ff.). From a consideration of the Lombard invasion of Italy and other contemporary events GUTSCHMID reaches the conclusion that the boundary cannot be drawn before the last third of the sixth century, nor after the first third of the seventh century.³ This agrees remarkably well with the conclusion which we reached on grounds of Latin linguistics. Beyond doubt the end of the sixth century marks one of the great watersheds in history.

A striking and gloomy picture of the Roman scene at this time is found in a sermon of Gregory the Great, which he delivered in the autumn of 593, under the immediate threat of a Lombard attack upon Rome, and while great parts of Italy were already under their sway. He had seen refugees who had escaped from them with the loss of their hands, others being led off to captivity or death. On every side he beheld ruin and desolation. He grieved with his flock, but his mind was filled not so much with dread as with those yet more melancholy feelings with which one contemplates a great and

¹ There was even a period in the Middle Ages (about the eighth century) when the name Italia fell out of use, and the title of Langobardia was used in its stead (G. ROHLFS, *An den Quellen der romanischen Sprachen*, Halle 1952, p. 177).

² WILLY STREHL, *Römische Geschichte* (1914), p. 569 (in STREHL-SOLTAU, *Grundriss der alten Geschichte und Quellenkunde* II).

³ The same opinion is shared by W. OTTO, *Kulturgeschichte des Altertums* (1925), pp. 4 f., and K. J. NEUMANN in GERCKE-NORDEN, *Einleitung* III (1912), p. 413: "Ihr Einbruch (i. e. der Langobarden) im Jahre 568 bedeutet für Italien den Fall des Reiches. Hier liegt für das Abendland die Grenze zwischen Altertum und Mittelalter; für den Osten bezeichnet das Auftreten Mohammeds (622, unter Herakleios 610-641) die Wende der Zeiten." It has been objected (by HANELL p. 20) that this opinion exaggerates the importance of the West in general world history, but in the present context, where our concern is the history of the Latin language, this objection loses its force.

self-inflicted historical tragedy. "*Quid est iam,*" he demands (Homil. in Ezech. II 6, 22 f.), "*quod in hoc mundo libeat? Ubique luctus aspicimus, undique gemitus audimus. Destructae urbes, eversa sunt castra, depopulati agri, in solitudinem terra redacta est. Nullus in agris incola, paene nullus in urbibus habitator remansit . . . Alios in captivitatem duci, alios detruncari, alios interfici videmus. Quid est ergo, quod in hac vita libeat, fratres mei? Si et talem adhuc mundum diligimus, non iam gaudia, sed vulnera amamus . . . Quia enim senatus deest, populus interiit, et tamen in paucis qui sunt dolores et gemitus quotidie multiplicantur; iam vacua ardet Roma.*" He compares the city, as the prophet did Nineveh in her overthrow, to the deserted lairs of lions (Nahum 2, 11): "*an eius duces ac principes leones non erant, qui per diversas mundi provincias discurrentes praedam saeviendo et interficiendo rapiebant?*" That power which once ruled the world is now like an old eagle, its feathers fallen and its wings broken.

This passage, which should be read in its entirety, is not simply a pathetic and eloquent sermon: it is, as GREGOROVIVS¹ calls it, a funeral oration over the grave of Rome.

¹ FERDINAND GREGOROVIVS, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, 4. Aufl., II, p. 45. His whole chapter on the pontificate of Gregory (pp. 36–69) is still of the greatest interest.

CHAPTER II.

LATE LATIN, VULGAR LATIN, ROMANCE

The arguments of the previous chapter make it historically appropriate and natural to apply the term "Late Latin" to the later stages of the Latin language down to about 600. Within this period widely different elements, as we have already noticed, are making themselves felt in both language and literature. There can be no doubt that the written cultivated language and the spoken language of the lower classes were already showing significant differences. Yet these differences should not be overstated, as they often have been. F. LOT, for example, in his much quoted study '*A quelle époque a-t-on cessé de parler latin?*' (ALMA VI, pp. 97 ff.), declares that probably as early as the time of Diocletian and Constantine, "et, à coup sûr, pendant le dernier siècle d'existence de l'Empire d'Occident (383-476), il y avait deux langues, celle du peuple, parlée par l'immense majorité de l'Empire, celle de l'aristocratie" (p. 99). He goes on to assert — this being the salient point — that the people no longer understood the cultivated classical language. Even Augustine, he maintains, could not have made himself understood by all his flock, "s'il leur parlait la langue de ses sermons." LOT even seems inclined (p. 123) to dispute the opinion of REGNIER¹ that in the language of Augustine "le latin vivait véritablement encore."

I find it very difficult to accept this view. It is of course highly likely that some small part of the uneducated peoples of North Africa, whose native tongue was Punic, could not understand the great preacher's sermons, with their highly rhetorical style.² This, however, is a special case and can certainly

¹ AD. REGNIER, *De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin* (Paris 1886), p. 2.

² Cf. below pp. 70 f.

not be adduced to impugn the character of Latin as a living language at the time in question. Witness to the contrary is borne by the fact that Augustine assumes his hearers to be more at home with Latin than with Punic, *Sermones* 167, 3, 4 (MIGNE 38, 910): *proverbium notum est Punicum, quod quidem Latine vobis dicam, quia Punice non omnes nostis.*

As regards the other leading Latin writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, the view of LOT¹ is that their language has "only the appearance of life"; but for this radical scepticism no grounds are given. Speaking of Ennodius for example (pp. 110 f.), he is content to repeat the words of LABRIOLLE: "des tours 'vulgaires' se mêlent bizarrement à sa rhétorique toute traditionnelle."² This is true in itself, but such a confusion is only one of the common divergencies between Late and Classical Latin, as LABRIOLLE himself admits.³

The following opinion is also rather strange (LOT p. 111): "Avec saint Grégoire le Grand (mort en 604), la langue latine ne se relève qu'en apparence. Nous manquons d'une étude d'ensemble sur ce sujet, mais il a été établi que les fautes de graphie incombent non aux scribes, mais à l'auteur. Pour lui aussi le latin écrit était une langue péniblement apprise et possédée imparfaitement." As regards the deviations in spelling from classical standards, this consists almost entirely in interchange of *e* and *i*, *o* and *u*,⁴ and is very far from proving the artificial character of Gregory's language, but rather proves the contrary, since these spelling variants of his are for the most part a reflection of real changes in the pronunciation. LOT's statement is not perfectly clear: but if it is intended to convey that Gregory, the greatest of the early popes, born in Rome of an aristocratic family, had imperfectly mastered his native language, the suggestion is too bold and too baseless to merit further discussion. NORBERG argues cogently against LOT's view in *Synt. Forsch.*, pp. 15 f.⁵ It is self-evident that the language of Gregory, for all its occasionally

¹ "En vérité, les textes latins du V^e siècle et de la première moitié du VI^e n'ont que les apparences de la vie," p. 128.

² *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, 1920, p. 653 (3. ed. 1947, p. 754).

³ Cf. *op. cit.* (3. ed.), pp. 747 f.

⁴ Cf. NORBERG, *Greg. Magn.* I, p. 20. From whom the vulgarisms come is rather uncertain. NORBERG, than whom there is no-one better acquainted with Gregory's style, says in this connexion "Gregorium aut potius librarios, quibus Gregorius dictabat."

⁵ M. A. PEI remarks (*Romanic Review* XXXVIII, 1947, p. 89): "Apparently Norberg does not know that Lot changed his mind in his later work, *Histoire du moyen âge*, vol. I, Paris, 1928, p. 612: 'Le latin parlé avait prodigieusement évolué depuis la fin de l'Empire romain. Or les hommes instruits, même dans le clergé, le prononçaient

colloquial or even vulgar expressions,¹ was not in the least like that used by the mass of the population. But we must not infer too much from this. The speech of a London docker is not difficult to distinguish from that which the Archbishop of Canterbury would use in a sermon, but the docker is not thereby prevented from understanding what the Archbishop has to say. No comparison is perfect, but I feel that this is a justifiable analogy.

Gregory's birth and upbringing kept him within the old classical tradition, but his lifetime saw the working of that ferment in the language of Italy which, as we have seen, achieved its full effect in the seventh and eighth centuries. That this process is connected with the decline of the school system is obvious enough, and for the schools as well the Lombard occupation meant disaster. "Viennent les jours sombres de la conquête lombarde: l'école profane, et avec elle la tradition antique, s'effondre."²

An opinion very different from that of LOT was expressed by the American scholar H. F. MULLER in his article 'When did Latin cease to be a spoken language in France?' (Romanic Review, XII, 1921, pp. 318 ff.). He concludes (p. 330) that "neither the Merovingian *capitula* nor the canons of the very numerous councils during the Merovingian period give any inkling that the spoken language was so essentially different from the written language that the latter was unintelligible to the people." His conclusion, after a consideration of the disappearance of the Latin passive — which might have been treated more fully — is that "in spite of the introduction of very important phonetic and morphological changes, Latin cannot be said to have lost its

comme la masse de la population et ils l'écrivaient à peu près comme ils le prononçaient.' " Nevertheless it seems uncertain how far LOT had in fact changed his mind, since the expressions quoted from the 'Histoire du moyen âge', although not completely clear, unmistakably refer to the early Middle Ages, 'La civilisation carolingienne', while in the study 'A quelle époque' etc. he is concerned with the end of antiquity. Moreover, LOT himself, in Hist. du m. âge p. 613, refers the reader unreservedly to his former treatment of the subject, which he would scarcely have done if he had abandoned the views which he there expressed. The very vague expressions in his latest work, 'La fin du monde antique et le début du Moyen Age' (éd. revue et corrigée, 1951), p. 436, do not give any clear answer to the question.

¹ Cf. below p. 17.

² H. I. MARROU, Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité (Paris 1948), p. 458. Cf. also pp. 453 ff.; p. 457: "c'est alors que la barbarie s'étend sur l'Italie; pendant près d'un siècle, de la fin du VI^e à celle du VII^e, ce pays, si longtemps le gardien de la tradition classique, voit le niveau intellectuel de la culture s'effondrer, jusqu'à un niveau quasi mérovingien."

character and become a dead language until the latter part of the eighth century." This dating, if a little late, probably comes nearer the truth than that of LOT. My own belief is that it will always be very difficult to fix with any precision the date of the various phases of development within the long transitional period 600-800.¹ The best contribution towards precision would now be a treatment of each problem individually, by a thorough linguistic investigation of a large body of material. For example, on the much discussed question of the development of the definite article, I hope to have established² that this took place at a much later date than that allowed by GRANDGENT and BOURCIEZ; MULLER's view,³ placing it in the eighth or ninth century, may well be nearer the truth. The same view is shared by LERCH, ZRPh LX, pp. 163 ff.; LXI, pp. 251 ff. In other words: "die volle Herausbildung der Kategorie des Artikels ist erst einzelromanisch" (HOFMANN, p. 481; WACKER-NAGEL II, p. 130).

I turn now to the main purpose of the present work: to notice some characteristic features and to trace some important tendencies in Late Latin. In doing so it will be necessary to devote more attention to the language in its transitional period than has commonly been done; a precise limitation of the territory is impossible, as we have seen. Even later Medieval Latin may often claim our attention, since despite a certain standardization, it is largely a direct continuation of Late Latin.⁴ Finally the testimony of the Romance languages has its own special significance, and many examples from them will occur in the following pages. "Le latin tardif explique le roman," says BOURCIEZ, "et le roman explique le latin tardif."

At quite an early stage in the development, despite the very varied nature of the material, we find some of the important factors which determine the peculiar character of Late Latin. Pride of place is taken here by the Christian influence, which will be discussed more fully in a later chapter.⁵ So profound a change as Christianity brought about in the whole spiritual life of Europe could not fail to have its strong effect in language also. Another important factor was the Greek influence, itself largely, though not exclusively, of

¹ Cf. above p. 2.

² See Syntact. I (2. ed., 1942), pp. 358 ff. and references given there; 373; 375.

³ Op. cit., p. 320; Chronol. p. 84.

⁴ See below chapter IV.

⁵ See below chapter V.

Christian origin. Indeed the ancient world during its last centuries was largely bilingual.¹ A third influence, undoubtedly the most powerful and the most striking to the linguist, comes from the lower levels of the Latin language itself, that is to say, from what is commonly called Vulgar Latin.

The nature of Vulgar Latin and the meaning or lack of meaning of the term has been the subject of lively and sometimes confusing controversy. In 1892 KARL SITTL declared in a remarkable article in *BURSIAN'S Jahresberichte* LXVIII, p. 226: "Das Vulgärlatein, mit welchem die Lateinisten operieren, ist ein Phantasiegebilde." More than thirty years later J. B. HOFMANN published his fundamental study of Latin colloquial speech, 'Lateinische Umgangssprache' (1926). In this he confined himself on principle to the more refined type of colloquialism, such as we find for example in the language of comedy, in Cicero's letters to Atticus, in satire, etc., and expressly declares in his preface (p. VIII) that he will not concern himself "mit dem Phantom des Vulgärlateins." NIEDERMANN, in a valuable review of HOFMANN,² declares on the contrary that Vulgar Latin is no phantom, but a very real entity; that it was in fact the everyday speech of the lower classes of Roman society, that is, of the vast majority of the Empire's population.³ This definition, like so many others, is not beyond criticism, but in essentials seems to me just, if inevitably somewhat vague.

The difficulty in forming a clear notion of what is meant by Vulgar Latin lies in the fact that even the most uneducated person, as soon as he begins to write, if it be only a letter or a few words on a plastered wall, is directly or indirectly influenced by innumerable literary precedents or reminiscences. Hence there is not, and cannot be, any document in pure, unadulterated Vulgar Latin.⁴ One only finds certain peculiarities and special tendencies reflecting more or less clearly the spoken language of the uneducated, and there are numberless gradations between the language of cultivated conversation and that of the unlettered populace. "Il n'y a que des traits 'vulgaires' qui se rencontrent en plus ou moins grand nombre et qui sont plus ou moins

¹ Some aspects of the influence of Greek upon Latin and vice versa will be treated in chapter VI.

² *Gnomon* III, pp. 347 ff.

³ Presumably HOFMANN in fact is of the same opinion: in later editions of *Lateinische Umgangssprache* the phrase quoted is modified to "mit der Frage des Vulgärlateins."

⁴ A more detailed treatment of this question can be found in my *Syntactica* II, pp. 354 ff.; cf. also MEYER-LÜBKE, *Einführung*, pp. 120 f. (with further references). The substance of more recent discussions is given in *Gnomon* XXIV (1952), p. 236.

voyants dans des textes d'époque impériale. Mais ces traits sont assez nombreux pour laisser discerner les tendances nouvelles" (MEILLET, *Esquisse*, p. 236; cf. also p. 239).¹

Vulgarisms occur at an early period, as for example in Plautus, often in Petronius (*Cena Trimalchionis*), in the Pompeian inscriptions, etc.,² while on the other hand there are strong literary influences even in texts which we are accustomed to consider as examples of Vulgar Latin. Hence it is very difficult to decide, without an intimate knowledge of literary forms and linguistic trends, whether a given usage or a given tendency is to be considered as vulgar or not. A very useful touchstone is often provided by the Romance languages. It is well known that these languages derive their origin not from the cultivated idiom of the upper classes, as known to us from the great works of the classical period, but from the speech-habits of the masses which developed in the different parts of the Empire. It is for this reason that a knowledge of the methods and results of Romance philology is very useful, and often quite indispensable, to anyone who concerns himself seriously with Vulgar Latin.

The same holds good for the student of Late Latin in general, since in this period the language possesses a much more marked popular element than before. The reason is not far to seek. The great literary tradition had broken down, and with the rise of Christianity there appeared a new style, simple, unaffected, and often popular.³ The decline of learning gave occasion for a number of compilations and translations — *Mulomedicina Chironis*, *Oribasius Latinus*, *Dioscorides Latinus*, etc. — works not of great value in themselves, but whose language gives us many interesting glimpses of contemporary spoken Latin. Finally the effects, even in the world of language, of the barbarian invasions and of the foreign and uncultured elements thus added to the population are too obvious to need emphasis. It is not surprising, therefore, that in Late Latin so many more or less clear examples of colloquial language are found, even in the leading writers on literary, ecclesiastical, or political subjects. A number of examples will be dealt with in the following chapters: a few only need be mentioned here.⁴

¹ A similar notion is expressed with great clarity by NIEDERMANN, *op. cit.* 348 ff., and by MARX, *Neue Jahrb.* XXIII (1909), p. 435.

² See also the excellent dissertation of V. VÄÄNÄNEN, *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes* (Helsinki 1937).

³ Cf. below pp. 68 ff.

⁴ A more detailed survey of some typical Vulgar Latin documents is given in *Syntactica* II, pp. 359 ff.; cf. also NIEDERMANN, *Ueber einige Quellen unserer Kenntnis*

Gregory of Tours, whose works — especially the *Historia Francorum* — are an invaluable source of information not only for the history of Gaul, but also for the development of Vulgar or semi-Vulgar Latin, belonged to a noble Roman family in Auvergne, and became bishop of Tours. Benedict of Nursia, whose *Regula Monachorum* so powerfully influenced western monasticism, was by no means lacking in literary education, but in certain parts of his works striking vulgarisms occur such as the genitive *talius* for *talis*, after *illius*, *ullius*, etc.¹ Partly this may be explained by his wish to be understood by the unlettered, but to some extent it reflects the normal speech-habits of the sixth century.

Even the official correspondence of Gregory the Great, as well as some of his other works, contains expressions which can only be explained as concessions to the popular living language. An interesting example is the use of *hostis* in the sense of *exercitus* — an eloquent testimony, be it said in passing, to the general attitude towards armed forces at that time. In this meaning the word is commonly feminine, probably under the influence of *acies*, *classis*, *legio*, etc. Some few examples may be found in the *Lex Salica* and the *Lex Visigothorum*,² and cf. also CIL III 11700 (funeral inscription over a soldier) *bello desideratus hoste Gutica*, rightly explained by MOMMSEN as *hoste Gothico*, i. e. *expeditione Gothica*. To this may be added two passages from Gregory the Great, Epp. II 32, p. 129,5 *si huc perexierit ipsa hostis*; II 33, p. 130,11 *estote solliciti, quia hostem collectam habet*.³ These are, so far as I know, the earliest examples of *hostis* in the sense of *exercitus*. The popular nature of this usage is attested by the Romance evidence, since both the meaning and, to a large extent, the feminine gender still survive (MEYER-LÜBKE II § 377; REW 4201).⁴ Another striking form in Gregory's letters is the substantive *parium* = *par*, meaning a pair, which is also paralleled by

des späteren Vulgärlateinischen, *Neue Jahrb.* XXIX (1912), pp. 313–342. Among modern works of particular interest are those of SVENNING and NORBERG.

¹ I have maintained the genuineness of this little-noticed form in my *Coniectanea* I, pp. 128 f. On Benedict's style in general see LINDERBAUER's commentary (1922), pp. 91 f. He notes that vulgarisms occur principally in the liturgical chapters and in those which give practical instructions.

² Cf. *Thes. L. Lat.* VI 3066, 2 ff.; *Lex Salica* 63,1 *si quis hominem ingenuum in oste occiderit*; GEFFCKEN, *Lex Salica* (Leipzig 1895), p. 231.

³ Both examples are from A. D. 592, and were emended by early editors. DU CANGE gives ample material from medieval sources.

⁴ Cf., e. g., Port. *hoste*, Span. *hueste*, Rum. *oaste*, all meaning 'army' and of the feminine gender; in other languages either masculine or feminine.

the Romance development (see below pp. 29 f.). Other morphological or syntactical variations from the classical norms are listed by NORBERG, *Greg. II*, p. 245. But in general the style of Gregory, although varying with the different nature of his works, bears the impress of the weight and authority appropriate to his unique position.¹

Generally speaking, the characteristics of Vulgar Latin are much the same as those of popular idiom in other countries and languages. Typical features are the tendency towards vigorous and concrete, even racy expressions, towards a style in which psychological associations have more weight than the logic of grammar, and in which words tend to be left out when they can be supplied from the context, while commonplace words may be pleonastically reinforced with more or less synonymous expressions. Hence there appear all those familiar licences in vulgar speech which we are accustomed to classify as assimilation, contamination, ellipsis, pleonasm, etc. But it would be wrong to assign these features exclusively to the vulgar language: in fact they play a very important role in the colloquial language of the educated, and even here and there in literary language. The differences are in degree, as we have observed, rather than in kind.² For our present purposes it is hardly necessary to give a detailed survey of these peculiarities, but a few examples may be given to show their importance for Late Latin as a whole or for early or late stages in its development.³

¹ On his own style Gregory expresses himself i. a. thus, *Ep. V 53 a* (p. 357,39): *non barbarismi confusionem devito . . . modosque et praepositionum casus servare contemno, quia indignum vehementer existimo, ut verba caelestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati.* This kind of declaration is of course a commonplace with many of the Fathers, but Gregory's works do nevertheless largely bear out its truth. Cf. NORBERG, *Greg. II*, pp. 227 f. on *adversus*, *ante*, *inter* with the ablative, etc. But his rhetorical training reveals itself in his care to secure an approved *cursus* or *clausula*.

² From this point of view also HOFMANN's 'Lateinische Umgangssprache' is of great interest, in which he lays stress on the distinction between colloquial and vulgar Latin. Among typical characteristics of the former he reckons the subjective and emotional tendency ('die subjectiv-affektische Seite'), the tendency towards the concrete and sensible ('der sinnlich-anschauliche Zug'), and finally the tendency towards economy or trivialization (brachylogy, ellipsis, use of a stereotyped *esse* or *facere* to save the trouble of properly differentiating). All these are obvious features of the vulgar language too, only in a higher degree. — MAROUZEAU (*REL XVI*, 1938, p. 174) rightly warns us against laying too much stress on the affective and emotional as an element in popular, unartificial speech; cf. also SLOTTY, *IF XLVII*, p. 192.

³ For a fuller discussion see *Syntactica II*, pp. 97–274. HOFMANN's *Syntax*, pp. 624 ff. and esp. pp. 822 ff., gives much material and a good analysis (further references to individual points in his *Index*, pp. 857 ff.).

A singular form of expression is found in the following inscriptions: CIL VI 18086 (BÜCHELER CE 1581) *quia nimius erat blandus ad illum*; XIII 2279 *dum nimia pia fuit, facta est impia*. Here the adverb *nimum* (or *nimis*) has been attracted by the adjective and assimilated to it. The construction is of course quite unclassical and of vulgar origin; it occurs, although hitherto unnoticed, in certain texts of the early middle ages, but not, so far as I know, in the higher and more cultivated style.¹ Cf. Fredegarius, Chron. IV 65 (MGH, Mer. II, p. 153, 6; saec. VII) *cum esset litteris nimius aeruditus*; further cf. Antidotarium Cod. Sangall. 44, p. 257 (p. 96 SIGERIST;² saec. IX) *ad omnia nimia ardentia adhibitum mitigat*. A similar expression occurs in Anthimus 67 *cocliar* (i. e. *cochlear*) *bonum plenum* (meaning *bene plenum*, although the adjective retains something of the meaning it bears in *bona pars*, etc.); Chron. Vulturn., Fonti LIX, p. 89, 12 (A.D. 947) *duo follicelli pleni boni de cozzumbru*. The material is rather scanty, but it seems not unlikely that this syntactical licence may have been fairly widespread in the spoken language. At all events the tendency is the same as that which gives rise in the Romance languages — particularly in colloquial style — to such expressions as Italian *Maria è tanta bella* (instead of *tanto*), *tanta grande alterazione*,³ *tutti pieni* 'quite full', *i gatti son troppi ladri* (for *troppo*; cf. *nimius* in the preceding examples), French *une femme toute pâle*, Old French *demie morte*, Spanish *medios muertos*, and similar expressions in other languages.⁴

¹ In J. S. NELSON's edition of Aeneas Silvius, *De liberorum educatione*, p. 184,5 (Washington D. C. 1940) the text reads: *Ovidius ubique tersus, ubique dulcis est, in plerisque tamen locis nimius lascivus*. It would be most extraordinary for this highly cultivated writer, later Pope Pius II (born 1405), to have admitted such a vulgarism. I feel quite sure that *nimius* is one of the many and serious misprints which render NELSON's edition almost worthless to the philologist. WOLKAN, in *Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, vol. 67, p. 142, has *nimum*, without any critical note, which is undoubtedly the right reading.

² H. E. SIGERIST, *Studien und Texte zur frühmittelalt. Rezeptliteratur* (Studien zur Geschichte der Medizin, 13), Leipzig 1923.

³ Cf. *Gesta Francorum* XXVI 5 (p. 352 HAGENMEYER) *tantam famem immensam habebant*, where some mss. normalize to *tam immensam famem*.

⁴ Cf. TOBLER, *Beitr.* I 77 ff.; MEYER-LÜBKE III § 130; NYROP V 144; FREI p. 57; LERCH in HAVERS' *Handbuch*, p. 120; ROHLFS, *Hist. Gramm. der unterital. Gräzität* (SB der Bayer. Akad. 1949), p. 208. On some more isolated cases, such as *species innumeras multas* (Amm. Marc.), *cocleas maritimas diurnas iustas* (Orib.), *eine ganze gute Frau*, *ein ganzes miserables Ross* (in colloquial German) see *Syntactica* II, pp. 111 ff.; SPITZER, *Aufsätze*, p. 254.

A common phenomenon, especially in Late Latin, is the blending and confusion of two dissimilar constructions, a phenomenon called 'contamination' by German and Scandinavian scholars, in English sometimes simply 'blending'. Cf. for example JESPERSEN, *Language*, p. 282: "Syntactical blends¹ are very frequent. Hesitation between *different from* and *other than* will result in *different than* or *another from* ... After a clause introduced by *hardly* or *scarcely* the normal conjunction is *when*, but sometimes we find *than*, because that is regular after the synonymous *no sooner*." The general statement of PAUL² is true, that such phenomena are particularly to be found in everyday, unpremeditated utterance. A typical example in Latin is the combination of *valere* with the genitive or ablative of price, whereby the notion of value is expressed twice over.³ This construction is found not only in the late vulgar language, but even in work of literary pretensions. Thus on the one side we find in the so-called Sortes Sangallenses⁴ 30, 9 *nullo valeat ambitio tua, nam non eris pretor*; and in a North African deed of sale from the fifth century (*Journal des savants* 1930, pp. 25 f. and 27): *quanti res eo tempore baluerit*; on the other hand ACO II : 3, p. 468, 24 *calicem gemmatum pretio multo valentem* (in the Greek text *πολλοῦ ἄξιον*); Digest. V 3, 25, 1 *si res minoris valet quam comparata est*; Sedulius p. 252, 10 HUEMER: *pluris valuit*.

Another phenomenon of the same kind is the use of a verb of saying together with *silere* and a negative, where either by itself would have been enough. Cf. Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Hist. Eccl. Trip.* IX 34, 1 *quod opus dignum memoria narrare non sileam*; Fredegarius, *Chron.* II 57 (p. 78,9) *narrare non sileas*; II 58 (p. 83,6) *mandare non sileo*; IV 81 (p. 162,18) *in ordine debeto referam et scribere non selebo*; *Form. Sal. Merkel.* 66 (MGH, *Leg. sect. V*, p. 263, 28; saec. VIII) *si aliquid nobis vultis mandare ... per vestra epistola nobis mandare non sileatis*. More examples of this kind could no doubt be brought forward from Late or Medieval

¹ As is well known, phonetic and morphological blends can also occur; see JESPERSEN *ibid.* 312 f.; CLARA M. KNIGHT, *Contamination in Morphology*, *Journal of Philology* XXXV, pp. 152 ff.

² PAUL, *Prinzipien*, § 110 ff.; for Latin see also *Syntactica* II, pp. 154–172; BLATT 168 f.; HOFMANN, *Umgangssprache*, pp. 163 f.; for French see NYROP V 34 ff.

³ A contributory factor was probably the weakening of the old *casus pretii* construction.

⁴ Most recently edited by A. DOLD, *SB der Oesterr. Akad.* 225,4 (1948). He assigns the work to the fourth century. The language is vulgar to a high degree.

Latin,¹ but it is most interesting to find a similar construction in the classical period: Bell. Hisp. 3, 7 *unus ex nostris respondit, ut sileat verbum facere*. The expression casts light on the stylistic gulf between the Auctor Belli Hispaniensis on the one hand and Caesar and his great contemporaries on the other.²

More widespread than these rather scattered idioms are contaminations of *tam* — *quam*, *et* — *et*, *vel* — *vel*,³ and the like. Particularly common is *tam* — *vel*: for example TARDIF, Monuments 2 (p. 2; A.D. 558) *tam in aquis vel insulis*; Acta Andr. et Matth. p. 45,17 BLATT: *tam in mare vel ubicumque*; Venant. Fort. De virtut. Hil. I 1 *tam qui dixerunt vel de quibus locuti sunt*; frequently in the Middle Ages, cf. Cod. Dipl. Long. I 17,7 (A.D. 685), et passim. Similarly *tam* — *seu*, MGH, Mer. III, p. 15,25; *tam* — *seu et*, MGH, Leg. sect. V, p. 29,9; *tam* — *nec non et*, Lucif. Calar. p. 192,11; Liutprand, Leg., prol. p. 108,2 (A.D. 713). A number of other variants need not be recorded; cf. Peregr. Aeth. p. 338; BLATT pp. 44 f.; NORBERG, Greg. I, pp. 99 ff.; UDDHOLM p. 172. Fairly common is *tam* — *et*, which occurs in the Corpus Iuris (Novell. Inst. 22, 47 pr.), throughout the Middle Ages, and sporadically even down to Luther.⁴ All these combinations, which are typical of a freer, less careful and less logical stage of language, can be paralleled elsewhere, but scarcely seem to have had any direct significance for the Romance development.

A more deep-rooted tendency is that towards pleonastic strengthening, when this does not arise from pure carelessness, but from a desire to emphasize the meaning or to strengthen a word that for some reason has come to seem inadequate.⁵ Some of these expressions were doubtless mere ad hoc creations, so that indisputable examples are relatively rare; this has sometimes led to unnecessary emendations. Such expressions belong to the powerful

¹ For expressions such as *numquam tacuit . . . docere* (Augustine), *taceant . . . disserere* (De imit. Christi), see Syntactica II, p. 157; ALL XIII, p. 428. In many cases one might say that *silere* and *tacere* are constructed analogously with *omittere*, *praetermittere*. On the difficulty of precisely distinguishing analogy and blending see PAUL § 110, note.

² As regards *silere*, it may be noticed that it does not survive in the Romance languages. Perhaps its use and its proper meaning had already become weakened in Late Latin.

³ In Late Latin *vel* is often used in the sense of *et*: BONNET p. 315; HOFMANN, p. 676.

⁴ Cf. De Libertate Christiana, p. 10,16 ed. SVENNUNG (Kleine Texte für . . . Vorlesungen und Übungen, 164).

⁵ On this tendency in general see Syntactica II, Kap. IX; HOFMANN, p. 857 s. v. Abundanzen; for Late and Vulgar Latin also SVENNUNG, Untersuch., pp. 533 ff. and 667; BLATT p. 160.

undercurrent of popular spoken language, and are shunned in the higher style of literature. Hence we often find some isolated examples in Early Latin, but afterwards none until late and, occasionally, medieval authors. Cf. Plautus fab. inc. 3 (LEO) *omni totae familiae*; Cosmogr. II 1 *hoc omne totum duas partes esse* (where RIESE: “*totum delendum?*”); Cod. Dipl. Long. II, p. 220,7 (A.D. 767) *totorum omnium ris* (i. e. *res*) *nostra*. For *omnes universi*, etc., see Glotta III, p. 173; HOFMANN p. 826. It is evident that *omnis*, which only survives in Italian *ogni*, was replaced at a late period of the language especially by *totus* in common speech and by *totus* or *universus*, *cunctus*, etc. in literary language;¹ so that the examples cited are not entirely fortuitous. but have — at all events in Late Latin — a particular predisposing cause.

For *unus idem* (by the side of *unus idemque*, etc.) the Thes. L. Lat. VII : 1, p. 190, 16 ff. gives a number of examples mainly from Early and Late Latin.² To these may be added Anecdota Rhet. ed. ROHDE³ p. 428 *his duobus modis una eadem ars docetur* (ROHDE inserts *et*); probably also Amm. Marc. XXXI 16,8 *uno eodem die*, where editors read *eodemque*. Both emendations seem needless; cf. Pl. Poen. 1340 *omnibus ... idem unum convenit*; Lucil. 570 *eodem uno tempore*; 887 *eodem uno ... modo*; Aug. De civ. Dei XII 12 tit. *eundem unum* (sc. *mundum*). Hitherto unnoticed are, e.g., Damasus, Chron. Vulturn., Fonti LVIII, p. 70,6 *uno die, uno eodem loco*; Vitas sanct. patr. Emeretens. V 3,15 (saec. VII) *semper idem unus vultus eius*.⁴

A much more frequent combination is *solus (solum) tantum*. A good many examples occur in both literary and vulgar Late Latin,⁵ and many more could be drawn from medieval sources. Some characteristic examples occur in translations, where the Greek original has simply *μόνος* or *μόνον*. Cf. Acta Andr. p. 55,3 BLATT: *non solum ego tantum* (*οὐ μόνον ...*); Anastasius

¹ Cf. Peregr. Aeth., p. 69; H. AHLEFF, *Vulgärlateinisch-Romanische Denkformen in lateinischen Heiligenleben der Karolingerzeit* (Diss. Münster 1933), pp. 25 ff.

² There are also two isolated examples in the Rhet. ad Her. and Pliny's Nat. Hist.

³ *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* hrsg. von A. FLECKEISEN CXXIII (1881), pp. 426 ff. According to ROHDE the text can hardly be later than the middle of the sixth century.

⁴ J. N. GARVIN, *The Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium* (Diss., The Catholic Univ. of America, Washington D. C. 1946), p. 198.

⁵ See LÖFSTEDT, *Krit. Bemerk. zu Tertullians Apologeticum* (Lund 1918), pp. 37 f.; HAGENDAHL in *Strena philologica Upsaliensis*, Festschr. ... P. Persson (Upsala 1922), pp. 74 f.; BLATT p. 54; HOFMANN p. 686.

(ninth cent.) in his translation of the Chronicon of Theophanes Confessor p. 92,4 DE BOOR: *solos tantum orthodoxos* (μόνους τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους). The Italian *soltanto* shows how this tendency persisted. Similarly Italian *ambedue*, Old French and Prov. *amdui*, and similar forms in other Romance languages testify to the disposition to strengthen *ambo* by adding *duo* (cf. GRÖBER, ALL I, p. 239; MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 411; VON WARTBURG, FEW I, p. 85).

Further examples are unnecessary at the present stage.¹ It is enough to note briefly the pleonastic strengthening of negatives, since this is a feature of general interest and importance, and seems to conflict with the logical principle that two negatives make an affirmative. But in fact cumulative negation is simply a redundancy, which occurs in practically all languages, though to a varying extent. JESPERSEN, who devotes a careful and profound study to the question,² gives examples ranging as far as the Bantu languages. The usage is essentially dynamic or emotive, and accordingly is especially frequent in colloquial language. In Latin there is no lack of evidence from the early period, as for example in Plautus, or further afield, as in Ennius Scen. 139 *quos non miseret neminis*. The most numerous and striking examples, however, come from the late and vulgar language. Cf. Petron. 42,7 *neminem nihil boni facere oportet*; often in inscriptions,³ e. g., DIEHL 3311 *nulli numquam*(m) *nocuit*; often also in the Mulomedicina Chironis and similar texts, e. g., Chir. 451 (p. 140,14) *quam numquam nemo scripsit* (in the Greek simply ἄ οὐδενὶ γέγραπται). For further details see Syntactica II, p. 212; BLATT p. 77. The same tendency remains alive in the Romance languages; cf. Italian *non vedo niente*, *non viene nessuno*, and other similar expressions in Romance languages (MEYER-LÜBKE III, § 961).

It is worth noting that, since the double negation "arises under the influence of a strong feeling" (JESPERSEN), it may sometimes occur in emphatic negations even in literary style. So we find in Cicero, Verr. II 24, 60 *debebat Epicrates nummum nullum nemini*, where the force of the double

¹ Abundant material is given in the works cited above, p. 21, note 5. On pleonastic strengthening of certain prepositions and particles see below chapter IX.

² O. JESPERSEN, Negation in English and other languages, Copenhagen 1917 (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Hist.-filol. Meddelelser, I 5), pp. 64 ff.; see also WACKERNAGEL II, pp. 299 ff.; HAVERS, Handbuch, p. 161; 256; HOFMANN, pp. 832 f.; Syntactica II, pp. 209 ff.; for the later periods also NORBERG, Beitr., pp. 109 ff.

³ KONJETZNY, ALL XV, p. 350; JEANNERET, La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines (Thèse, Neuchâtel, 1918), p. 150.

negative and the alliteration should not be weakened by deleting *n u l l u m*. As I have observed elsewhere,¹ one may compare to some extent the Shakespearian *nor never none shall mistris be of it, saue I alone*.

While the use of pleonasm arises from a striving, whether conscious or not, after clearness and strength of expression, the living language exhibits also a contrary tendency, namely towards syntactical shortening ('ellipsis'), which is achieved by omitting those parts of a normal expression which seem superfluous. This syntactical feature, which occurs in all styles and periods, has been so often and so thoroughly discussed,² that a few words here will suffice. It is common in ordinary speech, both vulgar and cultivated, but plays just as important a role in technical language (taking the word in its widest sense) and has often taken its origin from there. I shall confine myself to a few examples, some well known, others hitherto unnoticed.

While Livy speaks of *spolia opima*, we find in later authors *opima* alone (Plin. Paneg. 17, 3; Florus I 33, 11). An analogous usage is *civica* meaning *corona civica* (Thes. L. Lat. III, p. 1213, 10); more striking is *latus* for *latus clavus* in the Acta Arval. for A.D. 219 (CIL VI 2067, II 10), and *equestris* for *equestris statua* (CIL XIV 2120; DESSAU 6199).³ The ellipsis of *caro* is not uncommon. For *caro ferina* (Sallust and others) we find from Virgil on (e. g., Aen. I 215) *ferina*; from Plautus down to the late writers we find, e. g., *agnina*, *porcina* used elliptically, just as popular Italian still speaks of *la porcina*, (MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 6663).

To this common type of adjective-turned-substantive belongs *recidiva*,⁴ preserved as a technical term of medicine in most European languages. This appears as early as the sixth century, ACO I:4 (Rusticus, Synod.), p. 222, 12 and 223, 4; DU CANGE and BARTAL give a few examples from medieval sources. Here we must posit an ellipsis of *passio* or *aegritudo*, as in *caduca* ('falling

¹ Syntactica II, p. 214, where the reading is discussed at greater length.

² See, e. g., Syntactica II, Kap. X (many references); HOFMANN pp. 624 ff.; id., Umgangsspr., pp. 167 ff.; 204; HAVERS, Synt., p. 281; SVENNUNG, Untersuch., pp. 188 ff.; 272 ff.; 522 ff.; WISTRAND in Apophoreta Gotoburgensia Vilelmo Lundström oblata (Gothenburg 1936), pp. 46 ff.; TIDNER in Strena philol. Upsaliensis, Festschr. ... P. Persson (Upsala 1922), pp. 153 ff.

³ Neither inscription is given in the Thes. L. Lat., where the elliptical use of *equestris* is not noticed. See Syntactica II, pp. 255; 257.

⁴ Not in FORCELLINI, GEORGES, etc. Only SOUTER lists it, with what seems excessive brevity, under the reference "Rustic. S."

sickness') in Mulom. Chir. 490,¹ *perniciosa* (ibid. 156), etc. The ellipsis of *pars* must be understood not only in such well-known cases as *decima, centesimae*, etc., but with *dimidia* (Thes. L. Lat. V, p. 1205, 46), and, as SVENNUNG points out, *minuta* (Apicius IV 4, 2; V 5, 2); apparently also with *radicina*² (Pelagon. 27; 91; 314) preserved in Rum. *radacina*, Fr. *racine*; further, since *pars* often means 'a part of the body', *natica* (Soran. p. 79, 2; 87, 13; 88, 3) instead of *natis*, an interesting usage from the point of view of the Romance development (Fr. *nache*, etc.).³

In the theatre the rows set apart for the *equites* were called *quattuordecim ordines*: the use of *quattuordecim* alone in this sense first occurs in Asinius Pollio (Cic. Epp. ad. Fam. X 32, 2), and it recurs in later writers, cf. Suet. Div. Aug. 40, 1 *spectare ludos e quattuordecim*; Petron. 126, 7. The fateful part played by *famosi libelli* 'written denunciations', especially in the life of the late Empire, as under any despotism, is well enough known. But no-one has observed, so far as I know, that this common expression is sometimes shortened to simply *famosi*.⁴ Cf. Canon. S. Isid. ascr., col. 307 C (MIGNE 84) *hi qui inventi fuerint famosos in ecclesia ponere, anathematizentur*. — Another interesting ellipsis is of *die* after *albescente* 'at break of day'. SVENNUNG (Untersuch. p. 274) points out that, while Antoninus Plac. Itiner. A 11 has *albescente die* (so also Amm. Marc. and others), Aetheria (44,3) puts simply *albescente*, which survives in Calabrian *all' arbesennu*.

Ellipsis of the verb is also common, although perhaps less common than of the substantive. The examples comprise mainly *verba dicendi, verba agendi, verba eundi et veniendi*.⁵ This feature is particularly well attested in the free and unconstrained style of Cicero's confidential letters to Atticus, often written in great haste. Cf., e. g., VI 2,6 *Nonis Maiis in Ciliciam cogitabam* (sc. *ire*); so VIII 16,2 *ego Arpinam cogitabam*; XII 36,2 *tu ad villam fortasse cras*; in other cases verbs of writing, sending, etc. are omitted with great freedom: X 13,2 *illud admiror, quod Antonius ad me*

¹ See also Thes. L. Lat. III, p. 34,64.

² Cf. MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 6995: "hat *radix* in Nordfrankreich ganz, in Südfrankreich fast ganz verdrängt."

³ Cf. SVENNUNG, Untersuch. pp. 273 f.; MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 5848 (where the word is treated as simply an unattested reconstruction). Also ZAUNER, Rom. Forsch. XIV, p. 502.

⁴ Byzantine Greek took over the word as *γαμῶσον* or *γάμονσον*, a neuter substantive.

⁵ Exhaustive treatment in Syntactica II, pp. 244 ff.; cf. also HOFMANN, Umgangsspr. pp. 169 ff.; KÜHNER-STEGMANN II, pp. 551 f.

ne nuntium quidem (sc. *miserit*). This tendency was deeply rooted, and expresses itself through all periods of the language: an exactly analogous expression to Cicero's *Arpinum cogitabam* is found, e. g., in the thirteenth century in Vita B. Christinae Stumbelensis (ed. I. COLLIJN, Uppsala 1936), p. 17 *post haec meditando Parisios amicis meis valedicere gestiebam*.

One of the strongest driving forces in the development of language is the tendency to replace familiar, weakened and faded terms with concrete, striking, or coarse expressions, a tendency which is particularly marked in vulgar and colloquial speech. The inventiveness of a people in this department of language, especially when dealing with the parts of the body, is astonishing. JESPERSEN¹ has made a collection from English slang of fifteen different synonyms for 'nose'; DORNSEIFF² lists 25 German words for 'mouth'; and in regard to other parts of the body popular idiom is not less richly inventive. Most of these are certainly mere coinages of the moment, and are destined to a short existence, but the linguistic historian can find many examples of vulgar synonyms that have lived to play an important part in the development of language. A few examples may be given that are typical for Latin.³

The Romance languages bear witness (in It. *testa*, Fr. *tête*, etc.) that in common speech *caput* was largely replaced by *testa* 'earthenware pot, bowl', later 'brainpan, head', a development which is attested in the Latin glossaries, e. g., CGL V 526,39 *testa : caput vel vas fictile*. On the other hand the word *caput*, to some extent in Latin, and much more so in certain Romance languages, took over an abstract or transferred sense: 'main point, capital city, head man' (cf. It. *capo*,⁴ Fr. *chef*). It has often been observed that German *Kopf* and *Haupt* show a striking parallel: in meaning and form *Kopf* was once identical with English *cup*, OE *cuppe*, ON *koppr*. (Swed. *kopp*, Dan. *kop*).⁵

¹ O. JESPERSEN, *Mankind, nation and individual from a linguistic point of view* (Oslo 1925), Chap. VIII.

² F. DORNSEIFF, *Der deutsche Wortschatz nach Sachgruppen* (Berlin-Leipzig 1934), p. 194.

³ An exhaustive and valuable treatment is given by W. GOLDBERGER, *Kraftausdrücke in Vulgärlatein*, Glotta XVIII, pp. 8-65; XX, pp. 101-150; cf. also *Syntactica* II, pp. 350 ff.; HOFMANN, *Umgangsspr.*, pp. 154 f.; MEYER-LÜBKE, *Einführung*, pp. 108 f.

⁴ Frequently in such expressions as *capo del governo*, *capo della città*, etc. For further details see MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 1668; for the development in French see VON WARTBURG, FEW s. v. *caput*; below p. 36.

⁵ More details in FALK-TORP, *Etymologisk ordbog over det norske og det danske sprog*, s. v. *Kop*.

Haupt on the other hand has lent itself to various figurative meanings: *Hauptsache*, *Hauptstadt*, *das Haupt der Dichterschule*, etc. Comparable with *testa* is *concha*, surviving as *konka* in the dialect of Logudoro (Sardinia) with the meaning 'head'. The same development seems to have taken place in the case of *cochlea*, cf. It. *coccia* 'musselshell', 'bowl', 'head'. The tendency is, however, far older and more widespread than this: as early as the Fifth Dynasty hieroglyphic texts use the word for 'box' or 'case' to refer to the head.

Similar shifts of meaning are especially common in reference to parts of the body. Latin *rostrum* 'beak', occurs in Plautus (Men. 89) and afterwards in Petronius and later vulgar texts in the sense of 'mouth'. This usage persists in Old Rum. *rost* 'mouth', while in Spanish *rostro*, Catal. and Port. *rosto* the meaning has widened to 'face' (MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 7386). Another coloured and vigorous word is *bucca*, originally 'the (inflated) cheek', later simply 'mouth', from which It. *bocca*, Fr. *bouche*, etc.¹ In Latin the word was not confined to the uneducated, but found a place also in the everyday language of the cultured classes (cf. Cic. Ep. ad Att. I 12,4). On *spatula* and *pala*, properly 'spade', 'shovel', later 'shoulderblade', 'shoulder', see GOLDBERGER p. 35; VON WARTBURG ZRPh LV, p. 375, where also the geographical distribution of these words and their Romance derivatives is discussed.

Even in the case of the most ordinary verbs Late Latin had a predilection for more vigorous and active synonyms. For example we often find compounds of *iacere* used where the classical period would have had compounds of *agere*, *ducere*, or *ferre*.² This tendency comes to light most clearly in translations or refashionings of works of which the originals have survived. Several examples of this kind occur in the simple and unlettered style of the Itala, e. g., Exod. 32,4 (ap. Tert. adv. Iud. 1) *hi sunt dii, qui nos eiecerunt de terra Aegypti*, where the Greek text has ἀνεβίβασαν and the Vulgate adopts the more normal and classical *eduxerunt*. In other places the Vulgate itself has *eicere*, as e. g. Act. Ap. 5,15 *ut in plateas eicerent infirmos* (Gr. ὥστε ... ἐκφέρειν 'carried out'). The qualifying adverb is striking in Pass. Perpetuae 4 *quasi timens me lente eiecit caput* (sc. draco) where the Greek version has ἡρέμα ... προσήνευξε. Columella (first century) observes that certain young birds *possunt ... in agrum satis tuto educi* (VIII 11,15), but Palladius in his fifth-century compilation, Opus agr. I 28,6, alters this to *in agrum tuto*

¹ Further details in GOLDBERGER, pp. 31 f.

² Cf. RÖNSCH, pp. 361 f.; Peregr. Aeth., pp. 264 ff.; Symbolae Philologicae O. A. Danielsson ... dicatae (Uppsala 1932), pp. 179 ff.; SVENNING, Untersuch., p. 537.

eici possunt. Cf. also Mulom. Chir. 181 *praecipitur omnes morbidos agro proicere*.¹

After the same fashion compounds of *salire* sometimes take the place of *ire* or a similar verb. While at first *salire* signified a sharp or violent movement (Bell. Afr. 58,2), this nuance gradually disappears in later Latin. For Cyprian, e. g., the word *prosilire* has as a rule associations of haste or precipitancy; Lactantius likewise uses it in such contexts as *in iram*, *in insaniam*; but in later times the use becomes much freer. Cf., e. g., Acta Andr. p. 89,1 BLATT: *nec valeant quiscumque hominum vel iumentum exsilire* (in the Greek text: ἐξελθεῖν). This weakened meaning of *salire* must have been proper to Vulgar Latin, since the Romance development shows for example It. *salire* 'go up', 'mount', 'ascend', Span. *salir* and Port. *sahir* 'go out', Span. *salida* 'departure'. An interesting parallel is the use of *πηδάω* in Greek in a weakened meaning;² cf. PREISIGKE, Wörterbuch s. v. εἶς-, ἐκπηδάω, etc.; also WIFSTRAND (see Syntactica II, p. 351 n.) and LINNÉR, Studien zur Hist. Lausiaca (Diss. Uppsala 1943), p. 99. We may also compare the usage — very widespread in colloquial German — of *laujen* in place of *gehen*.

The same striving towards strengthening of expression underlies the Vulgar Latin predilection for frequentative rather than simple verbs,³ a habit which has left many conspicuous traces in the Romance languages. For example *adiutare*, not *adiuvare*, has given rise to It. *aiutare*, Sp. *ayudar*, Fr. *aider*; *ausare*, not *audere*, to It. *osare*, Sp. *osar*, Fr. *oser*; *cantare*, not *canere*, to It. *cantare*, Sp. *cantar*, Fr. *chanter*; *iactare* (or **iectare*),⁴ not *iacere*, to It. *gettare*, Fr. *jeter*, and so on. In many cases, as in those listed, the simple verb fell out of use. Concerning some other interesting expressions that are

¹ For *proicere* and *conicere* cf. Peregr. Aeth., p. 265; for *conicere* also Thes. L. Lat. IV 310. A striking analogy to *eicere* meaning *educere*, *efferre* is ἐκβάλλειν meaning ἐξάγειν, ἐκφέρειν in Late Greek. See on this point Symb. Philol., pp. 180 f.; Syntactica II, pp. 446 f. Apart from a few places in translated works the two languages have developed here, as so often elsewhere, along parallel lines, but without mutual influence. Cf. below p. 115.

² On *salire* we may to a large extent make the same observations as above on ἐκβάλλειν — *eicere*. But the Greek usage deserves a more careful investigation as to date, number of instances, and exact meaning.

³ NIEDERMANN, Quellen, p. 333; SVENNUNG, Untersuch. pp. 543 f.

⁴ On the vocalism cf. NIEDERMANN l. c., who starts from compounds such as *reiectare* (Fr. *rejeter*), Marcell. Empir. p. 158,3 (NIEDERMANN). A slightly different view is held by MEYER-LÜBKE, Einführung p. 158.

occasionally found, such as *exspuere* for *expellere*, *evomere* for *emittere*, *conradere* for *colligere*, and the like, HOFMANN (Umgangsspr. pp. 154 f.) and GOLDBERGER (passim) should be consulted.

To these examples of the general characteristics of Vulgar Latin, which so strongly influenced the rise and growth of the Romance languages,¹ there may be added some particular instances capable of throwing light on the continuity of the development;² instances of which at least some part has hitherto escaped due attention. As MEYER-LÜBKE observes (Einführung, p. 128), before attempting the explanation of any Romance word or expression, one must first carry the search into Latin territory. The converse is also true, that a classical philologist who has to handle any problem, grammatical, critical, or lexicographical, in Late Latin, will often find it indispensable to consider the evidence of the Romance languages.³

An example is afforded by Commodian, Instructiones II 18, 15, where we find the following very un-Virgilian hexameter: *Induite vestes quas oportet, frigus ut ostent*. It is apparent that the word *ostent*, emended by former critics, must mean something like *arceant*, and this is easier to understand if we remember that *o(b)stare* is the parent of Prov. *ostar*, Fr. *ôter* (which has been variously explained, see MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 6023). Further witnesses to the transitive use of *obstare* are cited by WEYMAN, Glotta IX, pp. 127 f., e.g., from a poem ascribed to Orientius, CSEL XVI, p. 248 *unde bonus pastor? maculam quod oculibus obstet* (where ELLIS declares *obstet* to be corrupt). In fact the meaning which confronts us in French and Provençal is clearly indicated, indeed anticipated, in Late Latin.

A curious development is that of the substantive *par* 'a pair'. MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 6219 observes: "Aneap. *pare* 'Paar', ital. *paia* und dazu neuer Sing. *paio* 'Paar' ..." This explanation of *paio* does not seem to me entirely satisfactory. The word is the perfectly normal development of the Latin

¹ It has been noted above (p. 16) that to some extent they also operate upon Late Latin as a whole.

² A number of similar phenomena will be treated in the following sections, particularly in chapters VII-IX. Some others are more or less fully discussed in Syntactica II, pp. 373 ff., with reference to earlier contributions by NIEDERMANN, BLATT, and others. Among more recent works of outstanding value are those of SVENNUNG and NORBERG, which particularly deserve attention.

³ See above p. 16.

substantive *parium*, which can easily be explained as a backformation from the normal plural *paria* (from *par*).¹ Admittedly *parium* is not to be found in our dictionaries, but it is in fact attested in both Late and Medieval Latin. Our starting point in proving the nature and antiquity of the form is provided by two passages in Gregory the Great, in letters of A.D. 598 and 602 respectively: Ep. IX 71 (II p. 90,17) *boves domitos parium unum, vaccas duas*; XIII 18 (II p. 385,13) *boves parium unum, iumenta capita quinque, oves et capras promiscuas capita viginti*.² The form *parium* is as much a part of the popular language as the use of the substantive in apposition instead of a partitive genitive (*boves* for *bovum*, etc.),³ and it is interesting to meet both even in Gregory's language.⁴ It is only natural that *parium* meets us again in medieval writers; cf. Regesta Neapolitana for the year 921 (CAPASSO, Monumenta II: 1, p. 23) *pullos parium unum*; Regesta A.D. 960 (ib. p. 85) *oblatus parium unum*; similarly the Chronicon Vulturense (Fonti LIX, p. 203,4 f.) in a document of A.D. 980: *pulli boni parium unum*.

In an important study 'Ueber die Unterlagen der romanischen Phraseologie' (Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen VI, pp. 1 ff.) M. L. WAGNER has drawn attention to a considerable number of phrases and expressions in different Romance languages for which Latin models either exist or can plausibly be assumed. He cites for example the idiom *se ducere* = 'go away, be off' in such cases as Asinius Pollio ap. Cic. Fam. X 32,1 *Balbus ... duxit se a Gadibus* (a contemptuous expression); Plaut. Aul. 708 *ubi ille abiit, ego me deorsum duco de arbore*; Bacch. 593 *duc te ab aedibus*. "Schwerlich wird man davon," says WAGNER, "das rum. *a să duce* 'fortgehen', 'davongehen', *du-te* 'scher dich zum Teufel' trennen können" (p. 3). The assumption is shown to be true when one reflects how often in late colloquial speech the idiom occurs even without any adverbial phrase of place, such as *ab aedibus* above.⁵ In such cases *duc te* has an exact correspondence with the Rum. *du-te*: cf., e.g., Actus Petri cum Simone c. 25 (Act. Apost. Apocr. I, p. 73,7) *istis testibus*

¹ Compare the late nominatives like *exemplarium*, *lupanarium*, etc., NEUE-WAGENER I 830 f.; similarly *ossium*, *vasum*, etc., ibid. 843; 854.

² Both passages are cited and correctly explained by NORBERG, Greg. Magn. II, 127 f.

³ On this phenomenon cf. HOFMANN 630; LÖFSTEDT, Peregr. Aeth., p. 326; E. WISTRAND, Vitruviusstudier (Diss. Gothenburg 1935), pp. 74 ff.; NORBERG, Beitr., pp. 6 ff.

⁴ See above pp. 17 f.

⁵ With an adverbial expression also in Ter. Hec. 522 *se duxit foras*, where some editors write *eduxit* with BENTLEY.

duc te et adduc filium tuum; Colloquium Harleianum 15 (CGL III, p. 641) *duc te*¹ *ergo! quid stas?* ibid. 16 *duc te! recede, impostor!* Mirac. Steph. I 4 *dimittis me et ducis te?* Aug. Serm. 167, 3, 4 (MIGNE 38, 910) *proverbium notum est Punicum . . . : nummum quaerit pestilentia; duos illi da, et ducat se*; Ps.-Aug. Serm. 111, 6 (MIGNE 39, 1966 extr.) *pestilentia ante ostium venit et nummum quaerit; duos illi da, et ducat se*; Ps-Theod. Prisc. p. 299,22 ROSE: *sic et illae verrucae siccentur et ducant se* (i. e. *abeant*). On some examples from Itala, i. a. in Lib. Sapientiae, see RÖNSCH, S. B. III 32, and THIELMANN, ALL VIII, p. 254. The usage survived into Medieval Latin, e.g., Excidium Troiae² p. 36,9 (Mercury to Dido) *dimittere te vult Eneas et ducere se*; cf. also p. 28,6. These examples will be sufficient.

The former usage may perhaps be compared with another remarkable reflexive construction, namely the French *s'aimer* in the sense 'be content, be at ease, take pleasure in'. The age of this usage cannot be perfectly determined, but at all events there are a number of examples from the sixteenth century. HUGUET³ quotes from Habert's translation of Horace's satires (1549) *l'un s'aimant à l'escrime, et l'autre à l'escuirie*; in Montaigne, e. g., *elles s'ayment le mieux où elles ont plus de tort*; and *je m'aime mieux douziesme ou quatorziesme que treiziesme à table*. A similar usage of *se amare* 'be pleased with oneself', 'be content' occurs in classical and postclassical Latin, particularly in the language of cultivated conversation (letters, satire); cf. Cic. ad Att. IV 18, 2 *belle mehercule* (sc. *haec fero*) *et in eo me valde amo*; ibid. IX 18, 1 *credo igitur hunc me non amare; at ego me amavi, quod mihi iam pridem usu non venit*. In these passages the expression signifies 'to be pleased with oneself', but later this shade of meaning disappears, and the meaning is simply 'to be glad or pleased (at something)'. Thus Horace, Sat. II 7,31 *ita te felicem dicis ama sque, quod nusquam tibi sit potandum*; similarly Marcus Aurelius in a short, intimate letter to Fronto, p. 78 NABER (HAINES I, p. 192): *vale mi — omnia mea — magister! Amo me quod te visurus sum*. I do not know of any examples from a later period, and until such are forthcoming, it must remain uncertain whether a real historical connexion between *se amare* and

¹ In the Greek text both here and in the following example the original is *ἑπαγε*.

² Edd. ATWOOD and WHITAKER, Cambridge Mass., 1944 (The Mediaeval Academy of America, Publ. No. 44). The date and place of the redaction, according to the editors (p. XV), are at present impossible to determine.

³ Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle I—, Paris 1925—.

French *s'aimer* can be established.¹ But even if we can only posit a parallel development in the two languages,² the comparison is still, I think, worthy of notice.

Better attested is the continuity in the use of *mittere*. It is well known that in Late Latin this verb takes over the meaning of *ponere* 'put, place, set' (RÖNSCH, S. B. III 59; SALONIUS 413), and that this remained its principal meaning in the Romance languages: It. *mettere*, Fr. *mettre*, Sp. *meter*, etc. But it is particularly interesting to see how early and how clearly certain types of phrase — typical, e. g., for modern French — developed and became fixed in Latin. In culinary matters etc. *mittere* occurs as early as Apicius³ in exactly such contexts where French *mettre* would be used; cf. De re coqu. V 190 *sfondylos elixatos teres et mittis ut ferveant*; Excerpta p. 80,3 *mittes ut coquatur*; but p. 80,5 *pones ut ferveat*; 80,31 again *mittis ut coquatur*. Like *mettre* again, it can be used of adding an ingredient or mixing it in with others;⁴ e. g., De re coqu. IV 179 *cum bullierit, mittes olei satis et anethi modicum fasciculum*; ib. 180 f.; 183 f.; V 186 *pultes Iulianae sic coquuntur: alicam purgatam infundis, coques, facies ut ferveat; cum ferbuerit, oleum mittis*. We find the same usage in Anthimus, De observatione ciborum (sixth cent.);⁵ cf. p. 2,12 *si autem satis⁶ aqua missa fuerit, nihil proficit*; p. 5,3 *cum cocta fuerit caro, mittis acetum acerrimum quantum media bucula, et mittis capita porrorum et puledium modicum*; p. 25,6 *cum cocta fuerint, acetum modicum mittatur pro sapore*.

The use of *mettre* in a different context, viz. *mettre le feu à*, is called to mind by an example from Cassiodorus-Epiphan., Hist. Trip. IX 46,3 (ed. JACOB-

¹ The treatment of *se amare* in Thes. L. Lat. I 1954 is quite unsatisfactory. The various shifts of meaning are not indicated, and the characteristic example from M. Aurelius is not given. To *se amare* we may add such expressions as Sen. Rhetor, Suas. 7,1 *ingenium tuum amas*; Sen. De benef. IV 15,2 *neminem non amare beneficia sua*. But it is not surprising that the earlier parts of the Thesaurus show defects, of a kind which were later made good.

² MEYER-LÜBKE (Einführung, p. 127) reminds us that parallel syntactical forms and constructions can easily arise quite independently in different quarters.

³ According to E. BRANDT, Untersuchungen zum römischen Kochbuche (Philologus Suppl.-Band XIX 3, Leipzig 1927), p. 129, this work is to be dated somewhere around A.D. 400, allowing a margin of at least fifty years in either direction. I quote after the edition of GIARRATANO and VOLLMER (Leipzig 1922).

⁴ Cf. in French, e. g., *mettre de l'eau dans du vin*, *mettre de l'huile dans la sauce*, etc.

⁵ Well edited by LIECHTENHAN (Leipzig 1928). See his Index p. 46 s. v. *mitto*.

⁶ In the Latin of this period *satis* often means 'very much' or 'too much'.

HANSLIK) *quam* (sc. *bestiam*) *octo paria boum in vicinum campum traxerunt; et misso igne combusta est, ne aerem fetore corrumpere*. Such expressions as *mettre un habit*, *mettre son chapeau*, etc. are familiar to us; so also Italian *mi metterò la roba mia dello scarlatto* (Boccaccio). This usage also is found already developed in Late Latin; cf. *Vitae Patrum* III 47 *ingressus cellulam suam misit sibi vestimenta corrupta, et egressus transiit in medio eorum; et iterum ingressus misit alia meliora, quibus solebat die festo uti*.¹ A somewhat later example comes from the *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum* (saec. VII–VIII), p. 47,5 (ed. SICKEL): *tunc episcopus Ostensis consecrat eum pontificem; post hoc archidiaconus mittit ei pallium. Deinde ascendit ad sedem et dat pacem omnibus sacerdotibus*. The intimate connexion with the Romance usage is apparent.

In the Late Latin (or early Medieval) version of the so-called *Physiologus*,² CAHIER III, p. 213, we find the following note on (*h*)*ydris* (ἑρμῆς in the Greek text³): *quum viderit crocodilum . . . dormientem aperto ore, vadit et involvit se in limum luti . . . et . . . insilit in ore eius. Crocodilus vero desubitatus vivum transglutit eum*. From this *desubitare* ‘to surprise’ (from *de subito*) are derived Prov. *desoptar* and O. Fr. *desoter*. The passage usually cited as the oldest occurrence of the word is Firmicus Maternus *Math.* III 3,14 (p. 110,25 KROLL–SKUTSCH), although the editors are in doubt as to the correctness of the reading.⁴ But even so, the example given above from the more vulgar language of a later period, is worthy of notice, as filling a gap in our scanty material. The simple verb *subitare* could be used either transitively — ‘take by surprise’ — or intransitively, in the sense ‘appear suddenly’. The latter use is found in the *Vita Cypriani* 15: *ad hortos eius . . . cum militibus suis princeps repente subitavit, immo . . . subitasse se credidit*. But the transitive use remains the more common.⁵ Cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* 60,2 *ut appareat nuper subitatos esse*; *Vita Cypr.* 15 *unde enim posset iamquam improvise impetu mens*

¹ The meaning is clear in itself, and is confirmed by the subsequent words: *dicunt ei: 'primum vestimento corrupto usus es et postea alio meliori'*.

² Edited by CH. CAHIER and A. MARTIN, *Mélanges d'archéologie, d'histoire et de littérature*, II–IV (Paris 1851 ff.). A new edition, based on a wider survey of the mss., is urgently required. In Uppsala University Library alone there are several manuscripts.

³ F. LAUCHERT, *Geschichte des Physiologus* (Strassburg 1889), p. 256.

⁴ So also the *Thes. L. Lat.*, where no other example is given. DU CANGE has a passage from the laws of Alfred, c. 23 (LIEBERMANN, *Gesetze d. Angels.* I, p. 63) *si canis hominem desubitet*.

⁵ GEORGES S. V. and MEYER-LÜBKE, *REW* S365, give only the intransitive use.

semper parata subitari? In the transitive sense the verb occurs also in Itala Apocal. 3,3 quoted by Primasius, see WÖLFFLIN ALL IV, p. 586; SOUTER, Gloss. s. v. This meaning was preserved in later times. An example hitherto unobserved occurs in Glossae medicales (ed. HEIBERG)¹ p. 32,17 *subitat eos haec passio aut in balneo aut in theatro*. These glosses are incorporated in the so-called Liber glossarum, which was compiled, according to HEIBERG, "in Hispania vel potius in Gallia meridionali circiter a. 700." This is perhaps not a pure coincidence, in as much as the existence of *subitare* is attested for this particular district; in the Romance languages the word survives only in Catalan, spoken in north-eastern Spain and a small area (Pyrénées-Orientales)² in southern France: *soplar* 'take by surprise', 'attack'. But even setting aside this localized occurrence, the example is to be welcomed as a link between Romance forms and their Latin models.

Interesting, but so far as I know unnoticed,³ is the use of *barba tuus* 'your uncle' attested by two passages in a donation of the year 762, Cod. Dipl. Long. II, p. 123,5 and 26. This is of course simply the Italian *barba* 'uncle'; cf. DIEZ, Et. Wb. 355 on *barbas* and DU CANGE on *barbanus*. DIEZ concludes: "also ein altes wort, wohl nichts anders als das lat. *barba* 'bart'. Ein zeugnis dafür gewährt die mundart von Como. Hier beschränkt es sich nicht auf den oheim allein, es ist überhaupt ein ehrentitel." Cf. below p. 51.

A type of construction which occurs not only in the vulgar, but also — and equally common — in the classical language, is the use of *in* with the ablative (in Late Latin with ablative or accusative indiscriminately) to signify 'in the form, guise, or shape of', 'playing the part of'. This example is illuminating for the continuity of the history of Latin in the Middle Ages, and has left its mark upon modern French usage. The development, however, has been somewhat complicated, and a number of examples from different periods⁴ may be necessary to cast light upon it.

¹ Det Kongl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filolog. Meddelelser IX, 1 (Copenhagen 1924).

² MEYER-LÜBKE I § 6 describes Catalan as "ein im VIII. Jahrhundert nach Spanien gebrachtes Provenzalisch."

³ According to JUD, Arch. f. das Stud. d. neueren Sprachen CXXI (1908), p. 98, n. 2, the nominative form *barba* first appears in this sense from the beginning of the ninth century.

⁴ Some of them are already given in my short notes in Eranos X 165, together with others which need not be discussed here.

The rôle that a man plays, in the ordinary sense of the word, is expressed by *in*, e. g., in Ovid Rem. am. 383 f. *Quis feret Andromachies peragentem Thaida partes? Peccat, in Andromache Thaida quisquis agat*. In other passages the same construction is used to indicate the character, form or appearance in which someone appears: cf. Ov. Met. XIII 187 *atque in rege tamen pater est*; XV 670 *in serpente deus praenuntia sibila misit*; Consol. ad Liv. 469 (on the dead Drusus) *haec sentit Drusus, si quid modo sentit in umbra* ('as a wraith'; cf. 432); in a later period cf. Apuleius Met. VI 29 *quodsi vere Iuppiter mugivit in bove*¹ ('sous l'aspect de', as VALLETTE renders it); Firm. Mat. De errore prof. rel. 12 (p. 27,21 ZIEGLER) *quod deus suus in cygno fallit, in tauro rapit, ludit in satyro*; on CIL VII 759 (saec. III) *militans praefectus in tribuno* ('as tribune') see BÜCHELER, CE 24, 10.

Still later the ablative and accusative became interchangeable: Augustine, De civ. Dei 20, 19 *dicimus 'sedet in amicum', id est velut amicus*; Comm. Instr. I 23, 14 *in supplicem prodis* ('i. e. supplicis partes agis', DOMBART); Schol. Iuv. II 147 *Nero et ipse pugnavit in gladiatorem et cantavit in scaena*. In the Ps.-Cypr. Cena p. 930 B (written according to HARNACK between c. 380 and c. 500) there is represented a feast at which a number of Biblical personages appear in various guises: *primus omnium procedit in magistro Jesus, in custodia*² *Joannes, in retiario Petrus, in secutore Pharaon, in venatore Nemiroth*, etc.³

In Medieval Latin the same use of *in* is found. A notable and very early example comes from the Liber Paenitentialis⁴ ascribed to Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury (ob. 690), but probably compiled somewhat later; in c. 27, § 19 (p. 293) it is laid down: *si quis in kalendas Januarii in cervulo aut vetula*⁵ *vadit, id est in ferarum habitus se communicant* (ed.: *commutant?*) *et vestiuntur pellibus pecudum et assumunt capita bestiarum: qui vero taliter in ferinas species se transformant, III annos paeniteant*. Cf. also Excidium Troiae⁶ p. 34,25 *in tali cultu Dido exivit: in Arpalice vestita*;

¹ Cod. F has *in bovem*, which can hardly be right at such an early date, cf. HELM ad loc. Many writers cite in this connection "*mugire in bovem* (Lex Salica)", but this is an entirely imaginary reference, arising from a pure misunderstanding of an expression in PORR's article — now more than a hundred years old — in HOEFER's Zeitschrift f. d. Wissenschaft der Sprache III (1851). (For this information I am indebted to Dr. G. PFLIGERSDORFFER of the staff of the Thesaurus-bureau).

² On Late Latin *custodia* in the sense of *custos* see below p. 152. The reading of the manuscript should not be altered.

³ This example is noticed by VÄÄNÄNEN on p. 19 of his study mentioned p. 37, n. 3.

⁴ Ancient Laws and Institutes of England (1840), pp. 277 ff.

⁵ It might appear tempting to take *vetula* as *vitula*, with CASPARI, Kirchenhistorische Anecdota (Christiania 1883), p. 175. Nevertheless *vetula* is perfectly correct here in its normal signification; cf. ROHLFS' interesting essay: 'Romanischer Volksglaube um die *Vetula*', in his work 'An den Quellen der romanischen Sprachen' (Halle 1952), pp. 18 ff., particularly pp. 29 f. Further examples in DU CANGE II 277 f.

⁶ Cf. above p. 31, note 2.

p. 35,2 *similiter et Eneas zaban indutus, galea cristata, in Martem una cum Ascanio ... et cum Didone exierunt.*¹

With all these expressions of varying form and date² we may compare another type of construction well known in the classical period, that in which *in* with the accusative has predicative or final force. To this category belong, e. g., Ov. Am. I 10, 25 *sumite in exemplum pecudes*; Liv. IV 61, 10 *proditori ... duarum familiarum bona in praemium data*; Tac. Hist. II 56 *milites ... refertos agros, dites dominos in praedam destinabant*; sometimes also with *esse*, e. g., Varro R. R. I 10, 2 *ensores ... dicunt in subsidium esse unciam agri*. The construction becomes more common later,³ e. g., Itala Gen. 30, 9 *dedit eam Iacob in mulierem* (LXX ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ Ἰακώβ γυναικα); Ambrosiaster In Eph. 1, 5 *ut ... adoptarentur in filios*; Hieron. Ep. 14, 9 *David pastor eligitur* (v. l. *adlegitur*) *in regem*; Oros. Apol. 24, 2 *quem unxit in regem*; Paulin. Nol. Epist. 50, 17 (p. 420, 4) *in servum venditus et in reum vinculatus et carceri datus*. Cf. also Thes. L. Lat. VII: 1, 768; GOELZER 348; SVENNUNG, Oros. 43; DIEZ, Gramm. III 172.

An interesting but little noticed expression of this kind is *in caput*, which occurs for example several times in Paulinus of Nola: cf. Epist. 42, 2 (p. 360, 17) *quam suavis sit in te dominus, qui factus es et positus in caput populi*; Carm. 24, 658 *Christus ... factus redemptis in caput*; with *esse* *ibid.* 25, 181 f. *namque omnes unum corpus sumus, omnia Christo / membra, quibus Christus corporis in caput est*. We may notice that this usage remained alive in the vulgar language of the early middle ages, e. g., Edictus Rothari 260 *ille qui in caput ex ipsis rusticis fuerit*; Liutprandi leg. 35, 6 (A.D. 723) *si quis seditionem levaverit*⁴ ... *tunc ille, qui in caput fuerit, anime sue incurrat periculum*; *ibid.* 94, 11 *ille qui in caput est*.⁵

This collection of examples may seem exceedingly dull, but it is necessary in order to give an adequate picture of the usage in question and its frequency in both early and late periods of the language.⁶ It seems to me that it is

¹ An example from *Alda*, a comedy of William of Blois (12th cent.), is adduced by VÄÄNÄNEN: *Ulfus pro coniuge natam / diligit atque vices in patre matris egit*.

² A special class stems from examples such as Cod. Iust. XI 24,1 *annona in pane ... exhibenda*; Cassiod. Var. V 11 *in auro vobis tres solidos ... elegimus destinare*; similar examples *passim*.

³ Graecisms (sometimes Hebraisms) are a feature not seldom found in Biblical language, e. g., Luc. 2,34 *positus est hic ... in signum cui contradicetur* (Greek εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον).

⁴ In expressions of this type *levare* means *concitare, excitare*.

⁵ From the phonetic and semasiological viewpoints (cf. above pp. 26 f.) this *in caput* is palpably equivalent to the French *en chef*. Whether the correspondence arises from similar independent development in the two languages, or reflects a real historical connexion, is a question to be solved by the Romance philologists.

⁶ The groups set out above merge imperceptibly into one another, and cannot be sharply differentiated, particularly as the accusative and ablative become phonetically identical in Late and Vulgar Latin (GRANDGENT §§ 94 f.).

here we must seek the model for the familiar French construction *parler en ami*, *agir en soldat*, etc. and for the corresponding idiom in Provençal, *parlar en fol*, etc. The problem that they present has repeatedly been discussed by Romance philologists,¹ but since they have either neglected or not fully taken into account the Latin background, they have not been able to offer any completely convincing explanation.² The question has lately been taken up more successfully by the Finnish scholar VÄÄNÄNEN, who has devoted a profound and interesting study to this point.³ He begins (pp. 15–19) with a valuable collection of Latin examples, to some extent supplementing the list given above, to some extent supplemented by it. He then gives it as his opinion that “Il est bien évident qu'on ne peut exclure l'influence des locutions prédicatives héritées du latin, pour expliquer le tour français et provençal qui nous occupe” (p. 33). Nevertheless we must note that the construction in question occurs only in the Gallo-Roman linguistic territory, and further that examples are almost entirely lacking in the oldest French texts (although there are early examples in Provençal). VÄÄNÄNEN is therefore driven to ask whether it may not owe its origin, or at least its development, to the language of the theatre,⁴ the language, that is, of the Latin comedy which held the stage in France and elsewhere in the Middle Ages (op. cit. pp. 33 ff.). Certain special phrases,

¹ Cf., e. g., MEYER-LÜBKE III § 406; EBELING in VOLLMÖLLER'S Krit. Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der roman. Philologie V 1, p. 203; CARIN FAHLIN in Zeitschrift f. französ. Sprache und Literatur LXIV (1940), pp. 467 ff.; 473. Material also in H. GERDAU Die französische Präposition *en* (Diss. Göttingen 1909).

² SUCHIER explained *parler en ami* as a contamination of *parler en amitié* and *parler com amis*, a view which is rightly rejected by EBELING. EBELING'S own view is expressed as follows: “Die zu Grunde liegende Vorstellung ist wohl die, dass das Sprechen (*parlar en fol*), das Handeln (*agir en ami*), kurz jede Tätigkeit als sich vollziehend gedacht wird in dem Bereiche (*en*) dessen, was der Begriff ‘thöricht’, der Begriff ‘Freund’ umschliesst.” Of this rather abstract explanation it has justly been remarked that it describes the usage rather than explains it. CARIN FAHLIN, who gives a valuable collection of examples from earlier French, recognizes the possibility that the modal function of *en* is derived from Latin, but in the absence of sufficient evidence from that quarter feels herself obliged to posit that the starting point was with verbs expressing a change of state — *changer en*, *habiller en*, with later transition perhaps influenced by the language of the stage.

³ V. VÄÄNÄNEN, “Il est venu comme ambassadeur”, “il agit en soldat” et locutions analogues en latin, français, italien et espagnol, Annales Acad. Scient. Fennicae, Ser. B, LXXIII, 1 (Helsinki 1951).

⁴ CARIN FAHLIN had previously hazarded the guess that the language of the stage might play some part in this connexion (see above note 2), but VÄÄNÄNEN was the first to develop the hypothesis.

VÄÄNÄNEN thinks, point in this direction; for details I must refer the reader to the original study.

I feel myself incompetent to decide how close this interesting theory may be to the truth,¹ but that explanation of Romance constructions must be directly or indirectly based upon the analogous Latin usage, seems to me beyond dispute.

¹ It seems doubtful whether it is necessary with VÄÄNÄNEN to lay a particular stress upon the predicative construction, when we find already in Old French expressions like *aler en messagier* and in Provençal *parlar en fol*, etc. (DIEZ, Gramm. III 172). EBELING (l. c.) mentions in this connexion simply Latin *in* with an accusative of direction, which is certainly wrong; cf. the examples with ablative cited above. As has been remarked, the various expressions cannot be strictly differentiated in character.

CHAPTER III.

LOCAL VARIATION IN LATIN

A problem of considerable interest, which has given rise to much discussion, is that which concerns local variations in Latin, particularly in the vulgar spoken Latin of the later period. A moment's consideration of the Empire's extent will make it clear that in its various provinces regional differences in speech, amounting to different dialects, must have arisen. Jerome himself testifies to the changes proceeding daily (*quotidie*) in the language.¹ Undoubtedly the Latin spoken by Roman colonists, mechanics, and soldiers in Spain differed in certain respects from that which one would hear in comparable circles in Gaul, Greece, or any other province. The original speech — Iberian, Celtic, or the like — of each province must have exerted some influence upon the speech of the conquerors, especially in pronunciation, but almost certainly in other respects also. Nevertheless we must recognize that these suppositions apply almost entirely to the spoken language of every day, which may have perished with hardly a trace surviving in the written monuments for us to read. As KROLL² rightly observes, the essential character of vulgar language is that it is not written, but spoken. This fact, together with the powerful influence of the rhetorical training that was a traditional feature of Roman literature, explains why the search for local variations, even in works of the later period, has been so barren of results. The same holds good in large measure of the researches devoted to inscriptions of Gaul, Spain, and Africa.³

¹ Comm. in Ep. ad Gal. II 3 (MIGNE 26, 357 A) *cum et Afri Phoenicum linguam nonnulla ex parte mutaverint, et ipsa Latinitas et regionibus quotidie mutetur et tempore.*

² Rh. Mus. LII, pp. 572 f.

³ So far as we can tell from written sources, even at a late date Latin retained the character of a more or less normalized and standard language throughout the Empire. See below p. 48; Peregr. Aeth. p. 19.

A further difficulty arises from the fact that the 'dialectal' differences may be in fact differences between speech of high and of low cultural level, so that stylistic differences are elevated into facts of linguistic geography (VON WARTBURG, *Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.* LV, p. 375). An interesting example is afforded by the two common substitutes for *edere* 'to eat': *comedere* and *manducare*. The reason why *edere* in Late Latin fell out of use and left no traces in the Romance languages is certainly, i.a., that commonly assigned, namely the similarity of some of its forms to those of *sum* (*es, est, estis, esse, essem*, etc.); while a contributory factor was the tendency in popular speech to re-invigorate a weak and faded word.¹ Thus, *edere* was replaced in common speech partly by *comedere* 'eat up', 'devour', a verb stronger in form and meaning, partly by the still more concrete, popular and picturesque *manducare* 'chew'. Both verbs play an important role in Late Latin and in the Romance languages: *comedere* gives rise to Sp. and Port. *comer*, *manducare* to Fr. *manger*, It. *mangiare*. Bearing in mind this geographical distribution, it is interesting to follow up the usage of the two verbs in some Late Latin texts of more or less vulgar character.² The more vulgar of the two is clearly *manducare*: it is the only verb of eating used by Aetheria (13 times); in the Itala it is the most common; Marcellus Empiricus does sometimes use *edere* and *comedere*, but *manducare* far more often (cf. NIEDERMANN's Index verb., p. 306). But the facts refuse to fall tidily into place. Anthimus, *De observ. ciborum*, has 35 examples of *manducare* and 23 of *comedere*, never *edere*; but in Oribasius Latinus (cf. MORLAND p. 157) beside *comedere* and *manducare* we often find *edere*, and in the *Mulomedicina Chironis*, to quote ODER's Indices, "*edere passim, comedere saepius, manducare decies.*"³

There seems to be no consistency;⁴ even within the Vulgate we find Matth. 26,26 *accipite et comedite*,⁵ *hoc est corpus meum*, but I Cor. 11,24 *accipite et manducate, hoc est corpus meum*. Yet it is the Vulgate which best helps

¹ On this tendency see above p. 18.

² Cf. WÖLFFLIN in SB d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil. u. hist. Cl., 1894, pp. 115 ff.; HOFMANN, IF XLIII, pp. 90 f.; CURT BEYER, *Die Verba des "Essens", "Schickens", "Kaufens" und "Findens" in ihrer Geschichte vom Latein bis in die romanischen Sprachen*, Diss., Leipzig 1934 (Leipziger Romanistische Studien, I: Sprachwissensch. Reihe, Heft 9), pp. 16 ff.; Thes. L. Lat. s. v. *edo* and *manduco*.

³ One would have been grateful for more detail in this connexion.

⁴ Sometimes this is to be referred to a striving after *variatio sermonis* (cf. HOFMANN l. c.).

⁵ But in Itala (cod. b) *manducate*, cf. Thes. L. Lat. VIII, 275,10.

to cast light on the problem. We find in it only 45 exx. of *edere*, but more than 540 of *comedere* (mostly in the Old Testament), and about 170 of *manducare* (principally in the New Testament). The disparity between the Old and New Testaments may seem strange, but allows of a simple explanation. Briefly, Jerome personally preferred the less vulgar *comedere*, and in the greater part of the Old Testament, which he translated directly from the Hebrew, this verb is much more frequent (more than 500 exx.); but in the Psalter and the New Testament, in which he revised the old Latin text (Itala) without large-scale alterations, *manducare*, which is the stock verb in the Itala, enjoys an undisputed supremacy (147 times, according to BEYER).¹ There is no real semantic distinction between the two verbs; the difference is simply that *comedere* belongs to a relatively higher cultural speech-pattern, *manducare* to the everyday speech of the many. "Wir haben es also hier nicht mit zwei lokalen Varianten, sondern mit zwei gleichzeitigen sozialen Varianten zu tun" (BEYER, p. 25).²

The conclusion that VON WARTBURG (l.c.) draws is that "Hispanien, das so oft auf eine feinere Ausdrucksweise Wert legt, bleibt bei *comedere*." But with due deference to the opinion of so great an authority, it seems to me doubtful whether these words express the real truth of the matter. The 'Feinheit' of any expression is unhappily seldom effective in gaining it popular acceptance. To my mind it is more probable that Spain, colonized early and geographically somewhat isolated, preserved *comedere* = *edere* simply because it was the older usage (cf. above p. 5). As early as Cato, *De agricult.* 156,1, we find *comedere* and *edere* side by side, for the sake of variety, without any difference in shade of meaning; while *manducare* in its weakened sense of 'to eat' does not enjoy any wide distribution before the rise of Christianity (Itala).³ We have seen a similar phenomenon in the case of *magis* and *plus* (above p. 5).

¹ Further details in BEYER, pp. 22 ff. — His statement in the table on p. 22 is not entirely correct. Petronius has *comedere* not 6 times, as he says, but 11 times; it is his most common verb of eating (*edere* 3 times, *manducare* only twice). According to BEYER Isidore uses only *comedere*; according to WÖLFFLIN l. c. p. 120 he has "gelegentlich" also *edere*, but *comedere* is his most favoured expression. — On *manducare* as "der gröbere Ausdruck" see also H. VON SODEN, *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (HARNACK and SCHMIDT, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. 33, 1909), p. 151.

² It is not until later, for instance the time of Isidore, according to BEYER (p. 23), that we can entertain the notion of a local element in the distribution of the verbs.

³ From the fact that Augustus in a letter (Suet. *Div. Aug.* 76,2) says *duas buccas manducavi*, we cannot justly infer that *manducare* was the everyday word meaning 'to eat'. The emperor is purposely using a colourful and vigorous expression by way of a joke, which also appears from *buccas* 'mouthfuls', cf. Petronius 44 *buccam panis invenire*.

To assign any text to a particular province on linguistic grounds has in most cases been found impossible, and at the best is extremely difficult.¹ It is not until the early Middle Ages, when the first beginning of differentiation into the Romance languages are found, that the case becomes different. A few examples from different periods may be of interest as showing what extreme caution is necessary in research along these lines.

In 1882 KARL SITTL published a work with the title 'Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des afrikanischen Lateins.' He sought to demonstrate that a large number of linguistic, particularly syntactical, peculiarities found in certain Late Latin writers, from Fronto, Apuleius, and Tertullian onwards, are related to their African origin, and should be treated as evidence for a dialectal variant form of Latin. This theory aroused great interest, and was accepted by many competent scholars (WÖLFFLIN and others), but the so-called 'Africitas' was soon shown to be a figment. Its alleged peculiarities are in fact very much the common features of Late Latin rhetorical prose.² SITTL's theory, propounded when he was only twenty years old, was subjected to a searching criticism³ by KROLL (Rh. Mus. LII, pp. 569 ff.), but had already been retracted by SITTL himself in a remarkable palinode (BURSIAN's Jahresber. LXVIII (1892), pp. 226 ff.; 236). The theory of African Latin now has no more than a historical interest, but it is instructive from the standpoint of methodology, as showing how easily one can generalize from a number of peculiarities in certain writers and be led thereby to false conclusions.⁴

¹ Cf. HOFMANN, 816: "Die Frage der Provinzialismen ist mit unseren Mitteln nicht zu entscheiden."

² NORDEN, Kunstprosa II 596, calls it "der griechische Asianismus (Manierismus) in lateinischem Gewande." Cf. also MOMMSEN, Röm. Gesch. V 658 n.

³ Cf. BONNET, p. 40, n. 3 (with important references); BRENOUS, p. 69, n.

⁴ A few examples may be given to illustrate the features in question. An indication of 'tumor Africus', according to SITTL, Lok. Verschied, pp. 92 f., is the use of the genitivus identitatis vel inhaerentiae, i. e. such expressions as *superbiae fastus*, *ira furoris*, *turbinis tempestas*, etc. These occur commonly in Apuleius, also in Arnobius, but cannot be considered as 'Afrisms', since they are not infrequent in Vitruvius (E. WISTRAND, Vitruviusstudier 42 ff.) and after him in late authors and inscriptions of the most various provenance (KROLL, l. c. 584; HOFMANN 395; for late Vulgar Latin see SVENNUNG, Untersuch. pp. 211 f.; LÖDDHOLM p. 107). In certain cases there is a Hebrew influence, operating through Greek intermediary stages, as in the translation of the Book of Sirach (THIELMANN, ALL VIII, p. 503). — An idiom which SITTL (p. 101 f.) and other scholars (WÖLFFLIN, THIELMANN, LANDGRAF) consider as peculiarly African is the uniting of the

Equally vain would be the attempt to point out in the racy and vulgar conversations in Petronius any peculiarities which would suggest, for example, that one or other of his ill-educated freedmen and nouveaux-riches was of Oriental origin, relapsing now and again into Semitic speech-habits. It is possible to point to some græcizing tendencies in word-formation and the use of suffixes, but these are common to the Latin of the early Empire even at its most popular levels.¹ There is likewise a complete lack of dialectal or South Italian Latin. A full and on the whole satisfactory treatment of the problem

positive with a superlative, as *saevus ac ferocissimus*. But we find in Cicero (De nat. deor. III 27,68) *recte et verissime*, and in a letter of D. Brutus to him (Fam. XI 19,2) *genus hominum . . . seditiosum et incertissimum*; similarly Bell. Alex. 3,1 *ingeniosi atque acutissimi* (altered by WÖLFFLIN); other examples in Vitruvius (PRAUN, Bemerk. zur Syntax des Vitruvius p. 79), Velleius Pat. II 69, and various non-African writers of a later period (KRÖLL, l. c. 586).

¹ Another vulgar construction is *meum intelligere nulla pecunia vendo* (c. 52,3). The substantivized infinitive in Latin has an interesting history, and develops along two different lines. On one side is the popular usage, as in Plautus, Curc. 28 *tuom amare*; 177 *totum insanum amare*; Bacch. 158 *hic vereri* (i. e. *verecundiam*) *perdidit*; this survives in the Romance languages, as It. *il piacere*, Fr. *le plaisir, le pouvoir*, etc.; cf. MEYER-LÜBKE II § 392; DIEZ, Gramm. pp. 920 ff. On the other, partly under Greek influence, the substantivized infinitive gained wide acceptance in scientific, grammatical, philosophical, and juristic language in Late and Medieval Latin; cf. WACKERNAGEL I 273 ff.; HOFMANN 577 f. (with further references); particularly WÖLFFLIN, ALL III, pp. 70–91. I append a few examples to show how long this usage survived in the Middle Ages, when the two lines of development practically came together; a more detailed study is much to be desired. Cf. Lex Ribuaria 5,1 (MGH, Leges V 214, saec. VI) *si autem audire* (in the normalized recension B *auditum*) *non perdiderit* (cf. Pl. Bacch. 158 cited above); Cod. Dipl. Long. II 236,1 (A.D. 768) *iuxta suo sapere* (cf. Ital. *sapere* 'knowledge, skill'); Vita S. Gisleni 16 (Anal. Boll. V, p. 233,18) *quia salus animarum suum semper erat sitire* ('his goal, his desire'); Troilus, ed. MERZDORF IV 470 *nec prius . . . deponant arma . . . quam ferus Aeacides vivere ponat ibi* (i. e. *vitam ponat*); similarly Ruodlieb V 117 *vivere claudit*. The most common usage is in such expressions as *secundum videri* ('apparently'), *secundum posse meum*, *secundum velle suum*, etc., but we find also in a poem of the ninth century (Fonti LII, p. 266,12) *quid . . . faciam, careo qui posse misellus?* ('who have not the power'); Ruodlieb IV 15 *in regis velle*; V 541 *eiusdem velle . . . repperies me* (cf. SEILER's ed. p. 124); Guido de Columnis, Hist. Destructionis Troiae (A.D. 1287), p. 220 (ed. GRIFFIN) *in eorum interesse*; p. 228 *in suo esse sit latens*. Sometimes this leads even to inflection of the infinitive: Chron. Vulturn. (Fonti LIX, p. 78,14) in a document of A.D. 927 *omnem vero licerem et potestatem tribuimus*. Cf. my Coniectanea I 129; BLATT, Fra Cicero til Copernicus (Copenhagen 1940), p. 99.

is given by WILHELM SÜSS,¹ with whose views LEUMANN (IF XLVI, p. 297) has expressed agreement.

The researches of the last decades into a number of important Latin authors are also of interest from the same point of view. An illuminating example is afforded by the well-known 'Peregrinatio ad loca sancta' of Aetheria (or Egeria).² The date of this work has been much disputed, but most scholars now ascribe it to the end of the fourth century;³ nor is there perfect agreement upon the writer's birth-place, but there are reasons for believing that she lived either in the south of France or in the north of Spain. The former view is supported by the fact that, when she wishes to give an idea of the size and violence of the Euphrates, she compares it with the Rhône; the latter is suggested — although not of course with any approach to certainty, by the great interest which the Spanish anchorite-turned-abbot Valerius (seventh cent.) takes in Aetheria in a letter to the Fratres Bergidenses (brothers living in Bergidum, in the modern Galicia in north-western Spain). To kindle the flame of religious zeal in his correspondents, he sets forth in detail the journey which she, a frail woman, undertook in spite of great difficulties and dangers, travelling to the Holy Land and to other places in the East, being herself *extremo occidui maris Oceani litore exorta*. The first to call attention to this important document was Dom MARIUS FÉROTIN,⁴ who drew from it the rather hasty and uncertain

¹ GUILIELMUS SÜSS, *De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis Cenae sermone vulgari*, Dorpat 1926, pp. 7 ff.

² Monumental edition by P. GEYER, CSEL 39 (1898); smaller edition by W. HERAEUS in *Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte I* (2. ed., 1921); on the text of the ms. see also R. WEBER, *Vig. Christ.* VI (1952), pp. 178 ff. The monograph of A. BLUDAU, *Die Pilgerreise der Aetheria* (Paderborn 1927), is of great value for the liturgical, geographical, and historical questions. On the language see my 'Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae', Uppsala 1911 (reprinted 1936); SPIRZER, *The epic style of the pilgrim Aetheria* (*Comparative Literature*, 1949, pp. 225 ff.); ERNOUT, *Aspects du vocabulaire latin* (Paris 1954), pp. 199 ff.

³ According to MEISTER in his article cited below, she will have written in the sixth century (he dates her return from Jerusalem between 533 and 540). This view now seems to have been controverted; see BLUDAU *op. cit.* pp. 245–286 with references to earlier criticisms of MEISTER by DECONINCK, *Revue Biblique* VII (1910), WEIGAND, *Byzant. Zeitschr.* XX (1911), BAUMSTARK, *Oriens Christianus* N. S. 1 (1911), and others. On the dating see also J. G. DAVIES, *Vig. Christ.* VIII (1954), p. 100 ("the final years of the fourth century").

⁴ In *Revue des questions historiques*, 1903. The letter of Valerius is printed in MIGNÉ, PL 87, 421 ff., and reprinted with a valuable commentary by GEYER, *ALL XV*, pp. 240 ff.

conclusion that Aetheria was of Spanish nationality. Other scholars, among them KARL MEISTER in an exact and valuable study,¹ have preferred to place her origin in southern Gaul (Aquitaine). I cannot go into the details of the interesting, but sometimes bewildering discussions of this question. The most recent review of it is given by F. WOTKE in PAULY-WISSOWA, Suppl. VII (1940), 875 ff.; an older account is that of FÉROTIN-LECLERCQ, *Étheria*, Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne V (1922), 552 ff. Nevertheless, a few short remarks may be pertinent to the question of the dialectal peculiarities which scholars have thought to descry in her style.

Even after the criticisms of ANGLADE² and GEYER,³ FÉROTIN-LECLERCQ maintain that there are some Hispanisms, "en petit nombre, mais certains" (l. c. p. 583). On the other hand MADER⁴ declares that the language "weist bes. auf den Dialekt von Südwestgallien od. Aquitanien (Burdigala od. Tolosa) hin." A brief glance at some of the principal arguments adduced in support may be of some interest. According to both FÉROTIN and ANGLADE, a striking Hispanism is the acc. pl. fem. *virgultas* (c. 4,6), cf. Sp. *verguita* from *virgulta*. But it is a mistake to suppose that this form belongs exclusively to Spain. Transfers from n. pl. in *-a* to feminine singulars of the first declension are well known in Vulgar Latin (cf. Peregr. Aeth. pp. 134 ff.; MEYER-LÜBKE II § 54); and as for *virgulta*, I have met it also in the Latin Oribasius, which in all probability comes from northern Italy;⁵ cf. *virgultae* Eupor. II 1, A 1, p. 425 (bis); *virgultas* ibid. II 1, H 7, p. 479; Synops. VII 8 (9), p. 140. We may also note *plicare* or *se plicare* (vulgar spelling *plecare*) in the sense 'draw near to', *appropinquare*: Aetheria 2,4 *iter sic fuit, ut per medium transversarem caput ipsius vallis et sic plecaremus nos ad montem Dei*; 6,3 *denuo plicavimus nos ad mare*; intrans. 19,9 *cum iam prope plicarent civitati*. On *plecare* (which gave rise to the Spanish *llegar*) FÉROTIN-LECLERCQ declare that in the meaning 'approach' it "ne se rencontre que dans les glossaires espagnols et dans le dialecte basque." To posit a Hispanism here seems to me rather rash; cf. DIEZ, Et. Wb. 463, on Spanish *llegar*, Port. *chegar*: "von *plicare* biegen, wohin biegen, d. i. nähern, eine auch dem it. *piegare* vergönnte

¹ Rh. Mus. LXIV, pp. 337 ff.

² J. ANGLADE. De latinitate libelli qui inscriptus est Peregrinatio ad loca sancta (Thèse, Paris 1905), passim.

³ ALL XV, pp. 245 ff.

⁴ Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, VIII (1936), 51.

⁵ Cf. below p. 49.

Bedeutung," for which he gives an example from Dante. For Rumanian see MEYER-LÜBKE III § 384. It should not be forgotten that in Byzantine Greek a verb *πληκεύειν* is found, which is simply the Latin *plecare* with a Greek suffix added;¹ see COMPERNASS, *Glotta* II, 125; NIEDERMANN, *Quellen* p. 315. Thus, e. g., in the *Tactica* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus *ἵνα πληκεύῃ ὁ στρατὸς εἰς ἀραιωτέρους τόπους*; further references in the authorities cited. This development also seems to me to indicate that the usage in question enjoyed a fairly wide distribution in Late and Vulgar Latin; it cannot have been restricted to a relatively isolated dialect.

I am no happier with the attempt to attach weight to Aetheria's favourite expressions *subire montem*, *subire in monte*, *in altiori loco*, etc. The construction is attested from classical times² onwards, and occurs in Late Latin texts outside Spain; cf. Vulg., Ioann. 6,3 *subiit ergo in montem Iesus*; Cl. Claudian (b. in Alexandria), *In Ruf.* II 279 *miles . . . muros subibat*. Nor is it true that of all the Romance languages it is only Spanish in which the verb survives;³ beside Spanish *subir al monte* we find Rum. *sui în munte* and similar expressions, and, as Professor ALF LOMBARD informs me, this is in all probability a direct continuation of the Latin *subire in montem*.⁴ Some other alleged Hispanisms, even less convincing than those cited, may be passed over in silence.⁵

The same cloud of doubt hangs over the Gallicisms which MEISTER and others have thought to recognize.⁶ The use of *primus* to signify 'excellent', 'first-class' (*praeclarus*, *elegans*) certainly has its descendant in Provençal, but it occurs in later Latin in the most diverse sources, e. g., Seneca, Petronius, Martial, Apuleius, Augustine, and others (*Syntactica* II, p. 385 f.; see also BORLEFFS, *Mnemosyne* LX, 1933, pp. 69 f.). In any case the expression *hortos primos* (c. 9,4) is without significance as regards Aetheria's origin; indeed the reading itself is not certain (see my commentary pp. 203 f.; at the present day my doubts are still stronger). — A usage beloved of Aetheria is

¹ L. R. PALMER, *A grammar of the post-Ptolemaic papyri* (London 1946), p. 134, gives a list of similar formations, such as *κουρατορεύω*, *πατρωνεύω*, *βουλλεύω* (from Lat. *bullare*), *δηληγαρεύω*, etc. etc.

² Hirt. *Bell. Gall.* VIII 15,1; Hor. *Sat.* I 5,25; Liv. VII 12,3, etc.

³ Cf. FÉROTIN-LECLERCQ l. c.

⁴ Cf. PUȘCARIU, *Et. Wb. der rum. Sprache*, 1687: "auffallend ist, dass sp. pg. *subir* dieselbe Bedeutungsentwicklung wie das rum. Wort zeigt."

⁵ On *consuetudinem tenere* see GEYER, *ALL* XV, p. 246.

⁶ Cf. the brief but well grounded criticism of BLUDAU, pp. 242 f.

that of *sic* in a temporal sense, e. g., *et sic* or *ac sic* meaning 'after that', and here MEISTER (l. c. 380 f.; 392) is inclined to see a characteristic of Gallic Latinity. But in fact this idiom has for a long time been known from authors of the most various birth-places; cf. PAUCKER, Rh. Mus. XXXVIII, 314; WEYMAN, ALL XIII, 209; STANGL, Pseudoasconiana (Paderborn 1909), 175 f.; my Peregr. Aeth., p. 231. However much of a cliché this *sic*, *et sic* may become in Aetheria, it cannot be adduced as a dialectal characteristic.¹

A less common and more peculiar use is that of *parvi* for *pauci*, cf. c. 49,2 *episcopi, quando parvi fuerint, ... plus quadraginta ... sunt*. According to MEISTER (p. 374; 392) this is an 'inverse construction', indicating a Gallic speech-habit.² In my commentary p. 339, I pointed out the uncertainty of this conclusion, and observed that the idiom in question was to be found in Tract. II 48 of the Spaniard Priscillian (*post dies parvos*). I can now add to this several examples from non-Gallic sources. Thus John, bishop of Antioch, in a letter (Acta conc. oecum. I : 3, p. 44,33) writes *diei solummodo unius, forsitan autem etiam parvarum horarum* (ὥρῶν ὀλίγων); cf. also Soranus, Gynaec. I 113 (p. 39,19 ROSE) *coopertoria etiam plurima vel parva* (cf. below p. 39,16 *aut plurimis coopertoriis ... aut ... parvitate eorum*).³ On other alleged Gallicisms I will not spend long. For verbs compounded with *per-* cf. BLUDAU 242 f.; Peregr. Aeth., pp. 92 f.; this type of formation is too common in Late and Vulgar Latin to be held up as an example of Gallic idiom. As regards the strange *hostibus* of c. 19,10 (cf. MEISTER p. 377) I am now inclined to agree with EHLERS (Thes. L. Lat. VI 3065,83); it is most unlikely that the word is here used in an entirely different sense from that in 19,9 and 19,13.

Other features of Aetheria's style, as even MEISTER admits, point rather in the direction of Italy (or other parts). This is the case with *post* used as a conjunction in the sense of *postquam*;⁴ on this usage cf. MEYER-LÜBKE III § 557.

¹ In the sense of 'thereupon' *ita* is found in Early Latin, and more frequently in late authors: NORDEN, Agnostos Theos p. 376; STANGL in Rh. Mus. LXX, p. 227; KROLL on Catullus 64,315; HAVERS in Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforsch. XLV, pp. 369 f. On the examples in Cato, where the temporal sense is not yet fully developed, see KEIL's commentary De agr. 54,4.

² In Provençal the Late Latin usage of *paucus* in the sense of *parvus* still survives. In classical times cf. Bell. Afr. 67,2; Rhet. ad Herenn. IV 33,45.

³ On the Latin translator see MEDERT, Quaestiones ... ad Gynaecia Mustionis pertinentes (Diss. Giessen 1911), p. 8: "sexto fere saeculo p. Chr. n. floruisse videtur in Africa."

⁴ A large number of examples are given in my Verm. Stud. 52 f. and in NORBERG, Synt. Forsch. 244 f.

It is interesting to find *cam(p)sare* 'turn aside', which is found in one passage of Ennius (Ann. 328) and thereafter in one passage of Aetheria (c. 10,8 *ut de via c a m s e m u s*).¹ In this sense the verb survives only in It. *cansare*, cf. MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 1562; JUD and SPITZER in Wörter und Sachen VI, 137. This and several other words cannot be made to suit the theory of Aetheria's Gallic origin.

If we start, then, from linguistic phenomena as our basis, we can never establish with certainty, or even with reasonable probability, the country of Aetheria's birth and upbringing. Her language offers a number of peculiar features which are of particular interest from the point of view of Romance philology, but she does not represent any one dialect.² The Latin that was used for literary composition was obviously even at her time a kind of 'Received Standard Imperial'; local variations in speech between the various parts of the Empire affected pronunciation principally, and of this our texts give us very little inkling.³

Another important source for our knowledge of late imperial Vulgar Latin is the so-called *Mulomedicina Chironis* (from the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century). In a dissertation making a valuable contribution to the textual and linguistic study of the work, GREVANDER tried to prove that it showed Sardinian affinities in its language.⁴ He expressed himself with great caution, and was content to suggest that the unknown compiler "irgendwie in näherer Beziehung zu diesem Sprachgebiet — Norditalien, Spanien, Sardinien, Sizilien — gestanden hat." But it is Sardinian on which he most dwells, and in this connexion his views have been convincingly rebutted by NIEDERMANN (Gnomon 1928, pp. 510 ff.), who emphasizes the fact that most of the

¹ Also in glossaries, e. g., CGL IV 227,38 *deverticulum, ubi c a m s a t u r*. MEISTER's statement (p. 376) that it also occurs in the Rule of St. Benedict c. 56 is incorrect; DUCANGE quotes it from the so-called *Regula Magistri* (saec. VII) c. 56 *c a m p s a n t e s modice de via*. But MIGNE (PL 88,1017 C) has a different reading.

² Cf. GEYER, ALL XV, p. 245, and the concluding remarks of FÉROTIN-LECLERCQ, l. c. 584: "Il faut se garder de soutenir l'existence d'une latinité propre à l'Espagne du IV^e siècle et, en définitive, la langue d'Etheria ne présente aucun caractère essentiel qui ne se rencontre sur d'autres points du monde romain." This is an eminently sound judgment, in my opinion, but is a little hard to reconcile with the statement that her language contains a small number of undoubted Hispanisms.

³ The *Peregrinatio* is only preserved in a ms. of the eleventh century.

⁴ SIGFRID GREVANDER, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Mulomedicina Chironis* (Diss. Lund 1926), pp. 129 ff.

Sardinian expressions which GREVANDER compares with the language of the *Mulomedicina* also occur in several other Romance languages. ERNOUT's study¹ of the use of the passive in this work is also interesting. He seeks to demonstrate that the tendency towards new formations (reflexive constructions; *fieri* with perf. pple.; *venire* with perf. pple.) which we find in the *Mulomedicina* can be paralleled in many different Romance languages: Rumanian, North Italian, Rhaetian; and although his material is comparatively restricted, his conclusions seem highly probable. It is quite certain that there is no homogeneous dialect underlying the language of the *Mulomedicina*.

At a rather late period — it is generally supposed about the sixth century — come the Latin translations from Oribasius. MØRLAND, who has published a detailed and valuable study on the subject,² concludes on linguistic and other grounds that they were written in North Italy. In this he is in all probability right; yet to my mind it is not the linguistic features principally, but the frequent references to Ravenna and northern Italy (MØRLAND 191 f.) that render it likely that the translators either belonged to or were in some way connected with a school of medicine at Ravenna.³ In addition there are some striking examples of wordforms or meanings which now seem to survive only in Italian or in the dialects of the South Tyrol; cf. MØRLAND pp. 98; 126 f.; 189 f.; 202. Among these we may mention *nascentia* meaning 'swelling', 'tumour', Old Italian *nascenza*; *sanguinentus*, O. It. *sanguinente*; *lacrimus*, cf. *lagremo* in the dialect of Erto in Venezia. But examples are few, few of them are persuasive, and a closer examination might well render some of them uncertain.⁴ For example, *suffrago* in the sense of 'knee-joint' survives not only in the dialect of Friuli (MØRLAND p. 102), but also in Catalan, as SPITZER⁵ points out. The feminine *virgulta*, which also survives

¹ Cf. *Philologie et Linguistique. Mélanges off. à Louis Havet* (Paris 1909), pp. 131 ff.

² HENNING MØRLAND, *Die lateinischen Oribasiusübersetzungen*, Oslo 1932 (*Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. Suppl. V). On their language see also A. THOMAS, *Philologie et Linguistique* (cf. preceding note), pp. 503 ff.; SVENNUNG, *Wortstudien*, passim.

³ This opinion, expressed first by THOMAS p. 504, now has the support also of SVENNUNG, *op. cit.* p. 136, n. 6.

⁴ Two forms which seem only to have survived in French and Provençal are noted by MØRLAND p. 189, n. 2. On *charivaria* see F. E. KIND's important note, *Philolog. Wochenschr.* 1933, p. 751. This is simply a corruption of the Greek *καρηβάγεια*, *καρηβαγία*. Further references l. c.

⁵ L. SPITZER, *Lexikalisches aus dem Katalanischen*, *Biblioteca dell'Archivum Romanicum* II:1, p. 121.

in Spanish, has been mentioned above p. 45. Among the many vulgarisms in the Latin Oribasius it may be surmised that there are many cases of this ambivalent character, and any attempt to assign a provenance on purely linguistic grounds would be attended by inescapable doubt.

As we have already noticed, it is not until the early Middle Ages and the differentiation of the Romance tongues, that the situation becomes different. An interesting example is afforded by the so-called *Compositiones Lucenses*, also called *Compositiones ad tingenda musiva*,¹ a collection of technical treatises on working in gold, silver, bronze, and other metals, on enamelling, colouring glass, notes on various minerals, etc. The language, which in many respects is strikingly vulgar, has been discussed by SVENNUNG in a valuable study, to which the distinguished Romance scholar GAMILLSCHEG has added some comments and amplifications.² The date of the work is not quite certain; it is preserved in a manuscript at Lucca which was written about 800, but the original redaction, which is palpably a translation of a Greek original, dates according to SVENNUNG from a period some generations, perhaps a couple of centuries earlier. At all events the Latin gives the impression of being later and more vulgar than, for instance, Oribasius Latinus. Both SVENNUNG and GAMILLSCHEG find good grounds for relating it to the idiom of northern Italy. Some striking pointers in that direction are the periphrastic passive with *fieri*, the form *prindere* for *prendere*, a typical North Italian pronunciation (GAMILLSCHEG p. 788, who cites MEYER-LÜBKE, *Ital. Gramm.* 48); furthermore the very remarkable *suventium* 'often', Old N. It. *sovenço*.³ With this strange formation from *subinde* we may compare *subindius* (analogous to *saepius* from *saepe*), e. g., CGL V 153, 17 and 484, 25 *subindius* : *frequentius*. It is unnecessary to adduce further details. Here the dialectal colouring seems clearly perceptible, even though GAMILLSCHEG also thinks that he can discern traces of a South Italian author.

Of great interest are the brilliant studies of the Swiss scholar P. AEBISCHER, from which I shall quote very briefly,⁴ since most of their material falls within

¹ Edited under this title by HJ. HEDFORS (Diss. Uppsala 1932) with German translation and commentary.

² J. SVENNUNG, *Compositiones Lucenses*, Uppsala, Upps. Univ. Årsskr. 1941, 5; E. GAMILLSCHEG, *Roman. Forsch.* LX, pp. 787 ff.

³ Cf. SVENNUNG 16; 147; 155 f.; GAMILLSCHEG 789 (against MEYER-LÜBKE, *REW* 8363).

⁴ For further details see ROHLFS, *Rom. Phil.* II, p. 24; A. KUHN, *Romanische Philologie*, T. 1: *Die romanischen Sprachen* (Bern 1951), pp. 180 f. et passim (*Wissenschaftliche Forschungsberichte, Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe*, Bd. 8).

the ambit of Romance philology. AEBISCHER has a profound knowledge of the medieval documents of Italy and elsewhere and an unfailing sense of the connexion between linguistic and cultural history; and these have enabled him, as ROHLFS puts it, to establish methods of medieval linguistic geography. For example, he has an interesting discussion of the distribution of the normal Italian words for 'uncle' and 'aunt', *zio* (from Gk. *θείος*) and *zia*, on the one hand, and the forms *barbas* and *barba*, known from Lombard documents, on the other.¹ JUD was the first to see that the type *barbas* originally predominated in the greater part of Italy, and was later driven out by *zio*. AEBISCHER explains this replacement and the connexion between *zio*, *zia* (older *thius*, *thia*) and the Spanish *tío*, *tía*; he observes that the disappearance of *barbas* and *barba* takes place about the ninth century, and precisely reflects the division of Italy into a Lombard and a Papal-Byzantine sphere of influence: *thius* survives at this period only in Rome, Naples and the adjoining districts, in certain parts of South Italy and the Exarchate, but gradually extends outwards from this time on.

In other countries also the seventh and eighth centuries mark the beginning of the period in which local peculiarities appear in Medieval Latin, in detail as well as in general character.² Scholars have sometimes overestimated the influence of the local vernaculars, but naturally it could not fail to be considerable, and in some cases surprisingly great. In the rich hagiographical literature of Ireland it has been possible to establish some reflexions of the Old Irish language.³ A striking peculiarity which can only be explained by the influence of the underlying Welsh idiom is instanced by PLUMMER, ALMA II 22: the Welsh *Uygat* signifies both 'eye' and 'fountain' or 'well', and *oculus* is found sporadically in the latter signification: *a dorso montis . . . usque ad oculum Dingurach* (Book of Llandaff). On German documents bearing signs of vernacular

¹ PAUL AEBISCHER, *Protohistoire de deux mots romans d'origine grecque: thius 'oncle' et thia 'tante'* (Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Lettere, Ser. II, vol. 5, 1936); on this work cf. VON WARTBURG in ZRPh LVII, pp. 651 ff.

² In a document from Asturia of the year 730 (E. MONACI, *Testi basso-latini e volgari della Spagna*, Rome 1891, p. 2) we find the following passage: *semper in oprobrium vivat, membris magis necessariis careat*. So far as I know, this use of *magis* for *maxime* is a Hispanism; Spanish *mas* (from *magis*) serves to form superlative as well as comparative.

³ See WILLIAM G. MOST, *The syntax of the Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae* (Washington, Cath. Univ. Amer. 1946), pp. 281 ff., and cf. LÖFSTEDT, *Coniect.* I 47 ff., but also L. BIELER on the Latin of Saint Patrick, *Vig. Christ.* VI, p. 73; 75, note 51.

influence, see H. BRESSLAU's indispensable 'Handbuch der Urkundenlehre' (2. ed.) II 339. His examples are sometimes good, as *terram proservire* 'Land verdienen', but not always convincing. Thus the illogical accumulation of negatives is a well-known phenomenon in Latin,¹ and does not need German influence to explain it. An interesting and more detailed study of similar problems has recently been published by L. ARBUSOW in his article 'Das entlehnte Sprachgut in Heinrichs 'Chronicon Livoniae'' (Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters, VIII, 1951, pp. 100 ff.). The Frisian laws have been treated by PHILIPP HECK in his book 'Uebersetzungsprobleme im frühen Mittelalter' (Tübingen 1931).

A clear and very instructive account of this sort of phenomenon has been given within a short compass by BLATT,² who takes Danish documents as his starting point, but extends his survey also to other countries. I cannot go into detail here on the numerous examples given by him and other scholars; there is only space to mention a few typical classes. As the different national languages developed more and more, and achieved independent status, it became progressively more understandable that a word from this source should be taken up into the Latin written in that country; it would of course be absorbed into the traditional system of inflexion. Thus *bondones* (pl.) occurs in Scandinavian documents, from Scand. *bonde* 'a peasant'. In English documents we sometimes find in the same way *lacca* (*laccum*) meaning 'lack', 'defect' in weight or material (BAXTER-JOHNSON); thus in Qvad. IV Ethelred VII 71 (A.D. 1115) *mercatoribus qui falsum et l a c c u m afferunt ad portum*. In German documents likewise *lacha*, *lachae* (Germ. *Lache*) 'lake', 'pond' is to be found, as in Cod. Lauresh. 381 (A.D. 851) *una l a c h a ad piscandum*. French sources offer us *prisonium* 'a prison', *potagium* 'potage', etc., cf. BLATT l. c. 28 f. The more vulgar a text is, the more frequent are these latinized words from the vernacular; in the more literary style they are avoided, and are got round with some more classical expression.

Another group of neologisms is produced by simple translation, as *viridis terra* for Greenland, *glacialis insula* or *glaciei terra* for Iceland, *insulae ovium* for the Faroes, *fundus aquilonaris* for the Swedish resp. Finnish province

¹ See above p. 23.

² F. BLATT, Sprachwandel im Latein des Mittelalters, Historische Vierteljahrschrift XXVIII, pp. 22-52; addenda thereto in Class. et Med. V, pp. 48 ff. (particularly in names of persons and places). See also the same author's 'Fra Cicero til Copernicus', Copenhagen 1940, pp. 131 ff. (a shorter and more popular treatment).

Norrbotten, etc. More difficult to detect, but not less interesting are those expressions in which a peculiar idiom of the writer's vernacular is unconsciously imitated in Latin. Thus in a German source we find *lux egreditur*, corresponding to 'das Licht geht aus', which would be unthinkable, as BLATT rightly remarks, in a Romance language; in English, however, 'go out' can mean *extingui* just as well as *ausgehen* in German. A similar phenomenon occurs in a Danish chronicle, where the foundation of the city of Roskilde is thus described: *huic civitati nomen imposuit post se et fontem*. This palpably translates the Danish *gav navn efter sig*, but such a use of *post* might in another place arise from the English *after* or French *d'après*.

With greater refinements of method and deeper knowledge of the language concerned than we at present possess, it will undoubtedly become possible to localize, on purely linguistic grounds, a text of unknown provenance. But at every step towards this end it is necessary to take into account the development of the individual Romance languages as well as the common usage of Medieval Latin. The same naturally holds good also if we wish to estimate the linguistic character even of well-known documents better than has hitherto been done. In a letter in *Diplomatarium Norvegicum* VI, p. 67 (from A.D. 1309) we find for example the following sentence: *in ecclesia Farensi sedit annis decem et amplius* (sc. *episcopus*). There is here nothing surprising in the use of *sedere*, as VANDVIK seems to find,¹ and certainly no reason for postulating the influence of Old Norse. In reference to bishops and popes *sedere* became a technical term in the early days of Christianity, and remained so all through the Middle Ages, cf., e. g., DIEHL III, p. 406; *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. MOMMSEN), p. 5,1; 6,1; 7,1, et passim; further examples are unnecessary.² — For other expressions a German origin has been sought, equally without reason.³ Thus *quibus sic stantibus* has been alleged to represent 'wenn es so steht'. But in Italian also the expression would be *così stando le cose*; furthermore in the whole development of the Romance tongues it is well known that *stare* frequently takes over the meanings and replaces the forms of *esse*.⁴

¹ *Symbolae Osloenses* XXIII (1944), pp. 94 f.

² We find this usage in the most diverse countries; see for example BARTAL on *sedere* meaning *in episcopali sella sedere* in Hungarian documents.

³ *Symb. Osl.* l. c. p. 95.

⁴ The first beginnings of the use of *stare* in a sense little removed from that of *esse* are to be found in classical times; cf., e. g., ERNOUT-MEILLET p. 1150; LÖFSTEDT, *Glotta* III 182 f.; BOURCIEZ § 233. For its use in Late and Medieval Latin see OTTINGER *Hist.*,

As for the particular form *stans*, I need only refer the reader to the examples given below, and to VIELLIARD p. 163 on this usage in the Merovingian documents: "sert dans nos textes de participe présent au verbe *esse*;" cf. also BOURCIEZ § 294 a. It is no less vain to assume Germanic influence in such a phrase as *hoc stet in regis potestate*; an example taken at random from a French-speaking district gives us *in potestate episcoporum steterat* (Chronicon Namnetense,¹ p. 94). On *tempus*, "denoting some indefinite period of time" (VANDVIK p. 95), see my Verm. Stud., pp. 77 f.; the usage is known from classical times onward, and has nothing whatever to do with any supposed Norse idiom.

Generally speaking, the Latin texts relating to early Scandinavian history show only the faintest trace of Norse linguistic influence. An example is the *Historia de antiquitate regum Norwagiensium* of Theodoricus Monachus (end of twelfth century), which is the subject of a special study by JENS HANSSEN (Symb. Osl. XXIV, pp. 164 ff.). HANSSEN finds no "single place where we with certainty may assume the influence of his (the writer's) vernacular." But, he thinks, there is one place where we may detect a foreign substratum: Theod. p. 45,2 *decreverunt mittendum pro Magno, filio beati Olavi*. The phrase *mittere pro* is modelled, he thinks, upon 'send for', and taken over from some English source (HANSSEN p. 179). But he only puts this forward as a possibility: "it would be interesting," he says, "if *mittere pro* could be instanced outside the English Latinity." In fact the construction, although not much noticed, is widely spread in Medieval Latin; a few examples will serve: *Gesta Francorum* (probably between 1096 and 1099) VI,1 (p. 168 HAGENMEYER) *imperator misit pro eo, ut veniret loqui . . . secum*; Albertanus Brixiensis,

Vierteljahrsschr. XXVI (1931), pp. 516 ff. The development may be illustrated by a few examples from Venantius Fortunatus (cf. LEO's edition p. 418): Carm. V 5,53 *qui tuus, ipse meus stat conditor atque creator*; XI 2,6 *te celante mihi stat sine sole dies* (*celante* intransitive, see LEO p. 411); VII 12,122 *longa stante die, dulcis amice, vale*. In medieval texts we find such stereotyped and rather different expressions as Chron. S. Benedicti, MGH, Script. III, p. 206,40 *quarto die stante mense Februario*; similarly in a document of A.D. 1098 in Miscellanea Cassinese III, p. 21 *VIII die stantis mensis Aprilis*.

¹ La chronique de Nantes, p. p. R. MERLET, Paris 1896 (in the 'Collections de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire'). The chronicle dates from 1050-1059, according to the editor. For the use of *stare* meaning *esse* cf. also p. 80 *cuius temporibus coepit ebullire rabies Normannorum talis qualis nunquam steterat* (in the French translation: "tellement que jamais elle n'avoit esté si grande").

Liber consolationis (A.D. 1246) p. 115,15 (SUNDBY) *quandocunque igitur tibi placuerit, mitta s pro nobis, et ... obedire erimus parati*; *ibid.* 117,10; often in Guido de Columnis, *Historia destructionis Troiae* (A.D. 1287), e. g., p. 19 *pro Medea filia sua misit, ut veniret ad illum*; p. 155 *pro quibusdam secretariis suis misit*; p. 241 *expedit ergo vobis ... mittere pro Anthenore, ut eum vobis constituatis in regem*; pp. 251; 252, et passim; *Gesta Romanorum* 244, app. 48, p. 644 (OESTERLEY) *mittam pro eo, ut audiat offensa*; *ibid.* passim; Étienne de Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques*,¹ p. 100 *cum ... mississet pro abbate suo, ut ei reconciliaretur*; KLAPPER, *Exempla aus Handschriften des Mittelalters* (SMT 2) p. 65,5 *misit pro illo ... ut veniret ante eum*.² Similarly with the synonymous *legare*, e. g., Petrus Alfonsi, *Disciplina clericalis*, ed. HILKA and SÖDERHJELM (SMT 1) p. 46,19 *rex ... in iram commotus pro puero legavit*. A kindred construction is the use of *pro* with verbs of asking (Eng. 'ask for', Germ. 'fragen nach'); on this usage and its continuance in Romance languages see SVENNUNG, *Orosiana*, pp. 37 f.; MEYER-LÜBKE III § 458. — On *mittere post aliquem* (likewise *abire, vadere post*), which is sometimes mistakenly treated as a Germanism, see BONNET 591 f.; SALONIUS 158 ff.; SCHMALZ, *Glotta* VI, 186.

There remain some other, more difficult problems, which have been discussed by distinguished scholars without any certain or agreed results having been reached. One of the most important sources for our knowledge of the economic circumstances of the Carolingian empire is the so-called *Capitulare de villis*, and it would be of great interest to know from which part of the empire this document comes. After DOPSCH had investigated the question from the historical viewpoint, E. WINKLER (ZRPh XXXVII, pp. 513 ff.) tried to show on linguistic grounds that it came from southern France. On the other side JUD and SPITZER (Wörter und Sachen VI, pp. 116 ff.) maintain that at least an equal number of peculiarities in the language points to northern France, but their concluding words are: "Wenn wir aber den Leser nicht von dem nord-franz. Character der Sprache des Capitulare überzeugt haben sollten, so haben wir ihn doch mindestens von der Schwierigkeit der Lokalisierung im Süden — und überhaupt der Lokalisierung in einer bestimmten Gegend überzeugt."

¹ Publiées par A. LECOY DE LA MARCHE, Paris 1877. The work dates from the thirteenth century.

² The same causal or final use of *pro* is found after *venire* *ibid.* 5,41 *nuncius mariti tui ... pro te venit* ('to fetch you'); similarly with *invocare* p. 44,10 *intimo animo inceptit pro auxilio diaboli invocare*.

Nevertheless WINKLER stood to his guns (ZRPh XXXVIII, pp. 554 ff.), and his case has, in the opinion of E. GLÄSSER,¹ been strengthened by later researches. How far this judgment is true, still remains to be seen.

Another interesting discussion has been that of the alleged Germanisms in Ruodlieb, a romance in Latin verse probably written about 1030 by a monk of the Bavarian abbey of Tegernsee. SEILER, in the preface to his useful edition,² lists a considerable number of Germanisms, of which many, in his opinion, are simply to be explained as German idioms translated literally into Latin (p. 138). The problem has however been attacked more recently by HANS OTTINGER in a most thorough and detailed study 'Zum Latein des Ruodlieb' (Historische Vierteljahrsschrift XXVI, 1931, pp. 449-535). On the subject of the Germanisms he reaches an entirely negative conclusion. He tells us that he began his work in the hope that he could demonstrate the German origin of the Ruodlieb on linguistic grounds alone, over and above the external indications such as its German names and glosses, the character of the manuscript, and the like. But he found not one indisputable Germanism. With KARL STRECKER, he concludes that the poet wrote "das ans Spätlatein anknüpfende³ Latein seiner Zeit." His language is in fact similar to that which is met with everywhere in the popular narrative Latin literature of the Middle Ages.⁴

In the main I find OTTINGER's arguments convincing. A few examples of different kinds may serve to illustrate them. The expression *consilium transgredi* (Ruodl. I 115) is according to SEILER p. 139 modelled on *gebot, rât iiber-gân*, but OTTINGER (p. 513) points out that it occurs as early as the Vulgate, Matth. 15,2 *transgredi traditionem seniorum*; *ibid.* 15,3 *transgredi mandatum*;⁵ similarly, e.g., Commod. Instr. II 17,12 *transgredi legem*, etc. One of the Germanisms that SEILER reckons outstanding is *peritus in* (SEILER p. 136); but cf. Ael. Spart. Vit. Hadr. 15,10 *in omnibus artibus peritissimus*; Greg. Tur., Hist. Fr., praef. p. 31,7 *peritus dialectica in arte*; other examples in OTTINGER p. 486. More peculiar perhaps is such an expression as *via (platea) vadit per villam*, which SEILER equates with *der wec gât* (p. 139). OTTINGER, however, (p. 523) draws attention to the many examples in Late Latin of the construction of a verb of going with *via*, as

¹ Zeitschr. f. franz. Sprache u. Literatur LXIV (1942), p. 454.

² F. SEILER, Ruodlieb, Der älteste Roman des Mittelalters, Halle 1882. Cf. especially pp. 114 ff.; 125 ff.; 136 ff.

³ Cf. below pp. 60; 62.

⁴ More details in OTTINGER p. 450.

⁵ The Greek text has *παράβαινειν* in both places.

Anton. Plac. Itin. p. 179,10 *via quae vadit in Gaza*; Vulg., Act. Ap. 8,26 *ad viam quae descendit* (καταβαίνουσαν) *ab Jerusalem in Gazam*; Peregr. Aeth. 14,3 *via quam videtis transire inter fluvium Iordanem et vicum istum*.¹ Nor can the use of the gerund or gerundive in final sense² without *ad* be considered as a Germanism (SEILER p. 125). This rather surprising construction is rightly explained by OTTINGER, who refers to my treatment of the subject in Verm. Stud., pp. 191 ff., where many examples are given from Late and Merovingian Latin.³

In most cases, the remainder of OTTINGER's criticisms are in my opinion no less well-grounded and convincing than those which I have cited. Nevertheless it seems to me uncertain how far we should be right in flatly denying any German influence at all in Ruodlieb. Probably we should do better to say that only a few isolated and uncertain traces of it are to be found. There are to be found, unless I am much mistaken — which is far from impossible — some peculiar features in the phraseology which point in that direction.⁴

¹ Still greater interest attaches to a number of examples which attest the presence of this construction in medieval texts of various provenance. From Italian documents we may cite CAPASSO, Monumenta II:1, Regesta Neapolitana, p. 74 (from the year 957) *via que vadit inter ipsam et inter terram d. Stephani*; p. 85 (A.D. 960) *via quantum per suum vadit*; Codice Diplomatico Brindisino I (Trani 1940), p. 21,19 (A.D. 1107) *via que vadit a Misanio in Lippiam*; p. 22,69 *via que vadit ad Sanctum Angelum*; p. 21,49 *juxta viam que descendit in rivos S. Leucii*. Similar examples may be found in other countries.

² E. g., IV 122 f. *intromittuntur regi consilium tribuendum*.

³ One could easily add a number of examples from early or late Medieval Latin: cf., e. g., Diplomata Belgica I (1950), p. 8 (A.D. 663) *licentiam nostram habeant faciendum* ('to do so'); Liutpr. Leg. 20,2 (A.D. 721) *si quis liber homo se defendendum liberum hominem occiderit* (and frequently in these laws); Liber Pontificalis p. 30,20 (MOMMSEN); Chronicon Salernitanum (MGH, Script. III), pp. 473,42; 484,1 f.; Gesta Romanorum 201, app. 5 (p. 613 OESTERLEY) *cum in silvam ivisset spacianendum*.

⁴ For example, the use of *laudare* in the Ruodlieb is very striking. In Medieval Latin this verb performed a number of functions which may seem rather surprising: most of them can without difficulty be derived from the well-known classical meanings 'praise', 'name', 'cite'. From these develop on the one side 'commend', 'recommend', 'advise', even 'approve', 'concede', on the other side *sententiam dicere* 'make known', 'announce'. See the detailed account given in DU CANGE; individual examples are given in BARTAL and BAXTER-JOHNSON. What is more remarkable is that in the Ruodlieb it is so often used — according to SEILER p. 317 not less than eleven times — in the meaning 'vowere', 'spondere': cf., e. g., IV 43 *induciasque trium laudant: ... ebdomadatum*; IV 115 f. *quos impunitos ... reddere laudares*; IV 199 *laudare laudavi cupiens ab eo superari*;

But problems of this kind, which turn upon subtle nuances, are exceedingly difficult, and, at all events, no definitive answer can be given at present to this one. Medieval Latin, with its local and stylistic variations — what FRANZ BLATT¹ has significantly called “les latins médiévaux” — presents a vast field for research, and one which has only just begun to be mapped.

V 36 *sicut laudavi tibi demandansque sponendi*; VII 85 *ter mihi succumbas ... volo laudes*, etc. SEILER (p. 138; 317) explains this construction as reflecting the influence of German *loben*, *geloben*, *versprechen*. OTTINGER p. 532 will not allow this view, but the only parallel that he can adduce is Leo, *Alexanderroman* ed. PFISTER (SMT 6), p. 76,12 *Alexander ingressus est ad te; laudasti et prophetizasti illi bene* (in Pseudo-Callisthenes II 1,3 only *Ἀλεξάνδρῳ εἰσελθόντι προσηύξω*). The meaning is not perfectly clear in this passage, and in any case is quite isolated, so far as my knowledge extends. The great frequency of *laudare* in the sense ‘promise’, ‘vow’ in the *Ruodlieb* remains remarkable, and perhaps it can be at least partly explained along the lines that SEILER suggests.

¹ *Eranos* XLIII (1945) 67.

CHAPTER IV.

MEDIEVAL LATIN

It now becomes necessary to amplify what we have already said on the general character, structure, and linguistic type of Medieval Latin as a whole. It has often been described simply and without reservations as a dead language, and has sometimes been compared even with Esperanto and similar modern artificial languages. Other scholars have protested vigorously against this tendency to deny the vitality of Medieval Latin, among them the great Romance philologist VOSSLER,¹ an acute and sympathetic judge of poetical and literary values, and long before him that indefatigable scholar, CHARLES THUROT.² WILAMOWITZ in his *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*³ boldly speaks of Latin as still being alive in the fifteenth century — a statement not lacking in those qualities of confidence and deliberate over-emphasis which distinguished that great scholar. A more solid and well-grounded treatment of the question is found in PAUL LEHMANN's brilliant article 'Vom Leben des Lateinischen im Mittelalter', first published in 1929, and now reprinted in

¹ "Wenn man . . . die kraftvollen Dichtungen bedenkt, in denen es (i. e. das Mittelalter) manchmal wider aufersteht: die Hymnen und Sequenzen, die frohe, derbe, ausgelassene Goliardenlyrik . . . so möchte man dieses Schullatein beinahe einem jener zeitlosen Elementargeister, etwa den Gnomen unter der Erde, vergleichen, oder gar einer Undine, die in heimlichem Verkehr mit einem auserwählten Manne wirkliche, lebensfähige Kinder bekommt und in der befruchtenden Umarmung zugleich für sich selbst eine menschliche Seele empfängt" (*Geist und Kultur in der Sprache*, Heidelberg 1925, p. 57). There is something romantic about this simile, but as CHRISTINE MOHRMANN remarks, it has a kernel of sound sense.

² CHARLES THUROT, *Notices et extraits de divers manuscrits latins* (*Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale et autres bibliothèques*, Tome 22), Paris 1868, pp. 500 ff.

³ Berlin 1928, p. 8.

his great work 'Erforschung des Mittelalters' (1941).¹ In recent years some short essays have appeared which have considerable interest, not only individually, but also in the fact that, although written by the most diverse authors, they show a general unity of viewpoint on Medieval Latin and its real character. I must be content to mention RICHARD MEISTER, *Mittellatein als Traditionssprache* (in *Liber Floridus*, Festschrift Paul Lehmann, 1950); LUDWIG BIELER, *Das Mittellatein als Sprachproblem* (in the new periodical *Lexis* II, 1949, pp. 98 ff.); CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, *Le dualisme de la latinité médiévale* (*REL* XXIX, 1952, pp. 330 ff.).²

As LEHMANN rightly emphasizes, Medieval Latin has its origin not in Classical Latin, but in Late Latin. However much the leading medieval writers may have striven in some respects to achieve a classical style, the starting point for Medieval Latinity as a whole is not the language of Cicero or Virgil, but the literary idiom that developed in the late Roman Empire with features derived from many different sources — classical and rhetorical, biblical, poetical, colloquial, and even to some extent vulgar. To these we may add the important Greek influence, which will be treated at greater length in a later chapter.³ Thus Medieval Latin is composed of heterogeneous elements, which had the language of the church as the principal factor tending towards unity and continuity. In this connexion I shall quote some words of LEHMANN: "Durch die christliche Geistlichkeit wird das buntscheckige Spätlatein für mehrere Jahrhunderte die führende Schrift- und Bildungssprache Europas." He adds as an explanation of this remarkable continuity: "Jahrhundert über Jahrhundert verging: die Vulgataübersetzung der Bibel blieb schier unverändert im Gebrauch, die Liturgie arbeitete mit ungezählten Formeln weiter, für Recht und Verfassung blieben die Satzungen, Beschlüsse und Aussprüche der Alten Konzilien, der früheren Päpste in Kraft, immer wieder las und kopierte man zur Erbauung und Belehrung seiner selbst und anderer die grossen Kirchenväter der ersten 6 Jahrhunderte des Christentums" (*Erforschung des Mittelalters*, p. 65). Naturally other elements must be reckoned with as well, which exerted a stabilizing influence, above all the inheritance

¹ This is a work of the greatest value, especially from a literary and palaeographical aspect.

² See also WALTER STACH, *Wort und Bedeutung im mittelalterlichen Latein*, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* IX, 1952, pp. 332 ff.; further references below.

³ See chapter VI.

from the culture of antiquity which formed a strong bond of union between the learned of all countries.¹

But stability and continuity do not imply deadness. Even though Latin from the end of the eighth century at the latest was in fact a learned language, the language of church and school, of administration and diplomacy,² of science and higher education, nevertheless within this sphere it achieved a liveliness, flexibility, and richness in expression such as no dead language — in the normal meaning of the word — can possibly exhibit.³ “Eine Sprache lebt,” says BIELER, “solange es in ihr Dichtung gibt”; and whether we think of the beauty of many Christian hymns, or of the poems in which the *vagantes* sang of love and spring, the truth of his observation may be understood. But even the everyday narrative prose of the Middle Ages, with its characteristic clarity and realism, or again the subtle refinements of the philosophical language used by the scholastics, bear witness to a genuine life.

RICHARD MEISTER calls Medieval Latin “eine Traditionssprache,” and CHRISTINE MOHRMANN considers (l. c. 333 f.) that of all the definitions hitherto proposed this one is “celle qui se rapproche le plus de la réalité linguistique.” The essence of this view, according to MEISTER, is that Medieval Latin is to be considered neither as a dead nor as a living language, but as representing a special kind of linguistic life, “eine besondere Lebensform der Sprache.” Certainly it is the ‘Traditionssprache’ par excellence, yet it was living insofar as it moulded itself to the various demands which medieval culture made upon it;⁴ it was written, understood, and to a very large extent spoken by the educated classes in all countries, and it gave rise to a large and living literature. But its essential quality cannot be reduced to a formula; it is in fact a unique phenomenon in the history of the European languages. Medieval Latin, says BIELER, is a language without a people; and he ends his discussion (l. c. 104) with a summing up from which I may be allowed to quote some

¹ Cf. CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, l. c. 337. — The problem is treated from a more literary and historical aspect by ERNST ROBERT CURTIUS in his brilliant and indispensable work ‘Europäische Literatur und Lateinisches Mittelalter’ (Bern 1948). The title of the work is in itself sufficient to suggest the view-point of the author.

² In Hungary, Latin was the language of administration well into the 19th century.

³ Cf. THUROT l. c. 500; 504.

⁴ Cf. CH. H. HASKINS, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1927), p. 129: “Indeed it is this very adaptability and power of absorbing new elements which kept Latin a living language until it was killed by the revival of antique standards in the fifteenth century.”

sentences: "Das Mittellatein ist demnach weder eine Nationalsprache, noch eine Weltsprache, noch auch eine internationale Hilfssprache, obwohl es das ganze Mittelalter hindurch, und darüber hinaus, diese Funktion hatte. Es ist weder ausschliesslich eine Kirchensprache, noch eine Standessprache. Es ist eine Sprache ohne Sprachgemeinschaft, und doch keine tote . . . Das Mittellatein ist die Sprache einer Ideengemeinschaft . . . die Muttersprache des Abendlandes." The mother tongue of western civilization — these are high-sounding words, and as unlikely as any others to express the whole truth of history; but they express a good deal of it, and after what we have said above, they will perhaps serve.

The same view of the peculiar character of Medieval Latin is arrived at, so far as I can see, through a more detailed study of the language itself. Any research in this field is inevitably difficult, in view of the enormous bulk of medieval literature, but it must be undertaken, if we are not to rest content with vague impressions and unfounded generalizations. As we have seen, Medieval Latin derives its origin from what is commonly called Late Latin,¹ and is its natural and organic continuation. Just as Late Latin often casts light upon developments in Classical or even Early Latin, so can Medieval Latin, as our knowledge of it improves, give us the clue to problems in Late Latin. Examples of different kinds may be found in my 'Vermischte Studien' and 'Coniectanea', and in the works of BLATT, NORBERG, and SVENNUNG.² I may cite here a few typical examples.

JEANNERET³ quotes from Defixionum tabellae a very early example of the intransitive use of *perdere* (first century of the Christian era): *malc p e r d a t*, *male exeat*, *male d i s p e r d a t*. This previously unparalleled usage survives, as NORBERG points out (Synt. Forsch. pp. 180 f.) not only in Venantius Fortunatus, but also, for example, in a poetical text of the ninth century: Abbonis Bella Parisiaca urbis I 61 *Aurora p e r d e n t e* 'when the redness of the dawn faded away'. The Old French *perdere* meaning *perire* 'to perish', is a continuation of this usage, as TOBLER observes (Verm. Beitr. I, p. 44 f.). — A similar peculiarity occurs in Commodian, Instr. I 30,9 *vixit et e x t i n x i t p a u p e r*, where it is not surprising that editors have doubted the soundness

¹ Cf. above p. 60.

² SVENNUNG's Untersuchungen zu Palladius (1935) and NORBERG's Syntaktische Forschungen (1943) are particularly valuable.

³ M. JEANNERET, La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines, Thèse, Neuchâtel (Paris-Neuchâtel 1918), p. 144.

of the text. But the intransitive use of *exstinguere* occurs also in the Chronicon Salernitanum (tenth century) and in other medieval texts, and is confirmed by Old French *esteindre* in the same sense; cf. Coniectanea I, p. 64; NORBERG op. cit. p. 181.

A construction which seems to have received little attention is found in Gregory, Dialogi III 7 (p. 148,4 MORICCA)¹ *quod tamen ad hoc² legentibus ut valeat exopto, quatinus . . . non praesumant*. After *valeat* one ms. (normalizing) inserts *prodesse*, but the medieval evidence is in favour of *valere alicui* meaning *prodesse, auxilio esse alicui* in Late Latin; cf., e. g., Gesta Romanorum c. 28 (p. 326,8 OESTERLEY) *sepe tamen illuc ibat, sed nichil ei valuit eo quod domina per omnia eum spreuit*;³ c. 69 (p. 382,38); c. 120 (p. 468,38) *dixit ei, quod medicina sua non valeret ei, nisi prius confiteretur omnia peccata sua*. Some very striking examples of the use of *valere* in the sense of *auxilio esse* are given by DU CANGE, and show how far this usage developed. For example, from a document of A.D. 1251: *licebit omnibus civibus Avinionis cuilibet amico suo valere de guerra*; and in another document: *promitto . . . quo vobis valeam et adjuvem vos*. Here the verb is used with a personal subject: we have reached the final stage,⁴ and what we have in these last examples is a remodelling of the Latin usage from the Romance idiom, in which the relevant verbs commonly mean 'help', 'protect'; cf. Old French *valeir*, for which GODEFROY VIII p. 143 quotes, e. g., *por vos valeir e aidier / e por vos toz reconforter* (Benedit, Chron. des ducs de Norm.); or cf. Sp. and Port. *valer*, etc.

If we study a sufficient number of texts from the centuries between the Merovingian period and the Renaissance, we find still further evidence for the view that Medieval Latin was a living language — living, that is, in that it adapted itself to different circumstances, usually of course taking Late or even Classical Latin as its starting point. We find for example many words, well-known or seemingly well-known from classical times, which now appear with different meanings, arising from causes which will be discussed in greater

¹ Fonti, vol. LVII.

² *ad hoc* refers forward to *quatinus*, here meaning *ut*, as frequently in Medieval Latin.

³ Such expressions as *nihil valere, plus valere* with a dativus commodi can be easily understood even from classical standards, and must have been the starting point for the construction in question.

⁴ Similarly we find in Medieval Latin *valentia* in the meaning 'assistance', e. g., *praestare alicui valentiam et auxilium, promittere alicui valentiam et adiutorium*; cf. DU CANGE s. v.

detail in a later chapter.¹ Another matter of equal interest is that we see again and again tendencies which were only sporadically exemplified in earlier periods, growing and spreading to an overwhelming degree in medieval times. A striking example is the peculiar use of *nedum . . . sed etiam* for *non solum . . . sed etiam*. I recently² drew attention to the fact that this construction only occurs once in classical times, in a letter of Balbus and Oppius to Cicero (ad Att. IX 7 A, 1), and even among the later writers there is no clear-cut example from antiquity. Yet this is not an isolated grammatical lapse, as one might have been inclined to believe, since it reappears in Medieval Latin, for example in the Acta Sanctorum, where it occurs several times. In some writers of the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance it is a favourite construction.³ This example strikingly illustrates the unity of Latin literature, in which even the latest period may cast light on the earlier, and vice versa.

A similar phenomenon, this time in the field of semantics, is the use of *dubitare* in the sense of *timere*. Such an expression as *dubitare de salute alicuius* is good Ciceronian Latin, and the Thes. L. Lat. gives many examples from later writers in which 'inest notio quaedam timendi' (V : 1, p. 2092,40 ff. and 2098,35 ff.). This change of nuance is clearly visible in Cod. Just. VII 4,17 pr.: *veteris iuris interpretes dubitabant, ne quod obstaculum libertati ex hac causa procedat*. The verb denotes hesitation as well as fear, but it is construed simply as a verbum timendi. The same applies to Cassiodorus, Variae VIII 3,1. (A.D. 526). DU CANGE only gives one example from the Middle Ages, and even that is not perfectly clear. Nevertheless the meaning 'to fear', even with an acc. obj., does develop gradually during this period into a common and accepted usage. We find it in the Acta Sanctorum and in the Alexander romance of Leo⁴ (saec. X): e. g., I 43 *Alexander, non rebellando tibi clausimus portas, sed dubitando Darium, regem Persarum*;⁵ it occurs also in the Historia Destructionis Troiae (written A.D. 1287),⁶ in the Gesta Romanorum, in British writers (BAXTER-JOHNSON s. v.),⁷ etc. The organic nature of this

¹ See below pp. 156 ff.

² Coniectanea I, pp. 67 ff.

³ Op. cit. p. 69.

⁴ Der Alexanderroman des Archipresbyters Leo, hg. von FR. PFISTER (SMT 6, Heidelberg 1913), p. 71,21.

⁵ Callisthenes p. 50,25 (KROLL) has *δεδοικότες τὴν τῶν Περσῶν βασιλείαν*.

⁶ Ed. by GRIFFIN, Cambridge (Mass.) 1936.

⁷ References in Eranos XLIV, pp. 350 ff.

development is shown by the fact that the meaning 'to fear' is preserved in the Romance languages: in Old French (e. g., *a ces qui d o t e n t Deu riens ne lor faut*) as well as in Old Provençal and Old Italian.¹

A striking usage, and one that is extremely rare in antiquity is the use of *sedere* in the sense of *esse* 'to be' (Fr. *se trouver*) with a non-personal subject. An early example occurs in the Itinerarium of Antoninus Placentinus (about A.D. 570 or 580) c. 5 (CSEL 39, p. 161,14): *Deinde venimus in civitatem Nazareth, in qua sunt multae virtutes.*² *Ibi etiam s e d i t in synagoga tomus, in quo abcd habuit Dominus inpositum.* GEYER³ notices the strange use of *sedere*, and observes that it has become so weakened as to differ very little from *esse*. A similar use of *residere* is found in c. 20 (p. 172,19) *stella apparet in caelo et venit super locum, ubi crux r e s e d i t.*⁴ GEYER also cites an example from the Formulae Andecavenses c. 35 (MGH, Leg. sect. V, p. 16,12) of the sixth or seventh century: *ubi ipsa casa r e s e d i t*; to which we may add from c. 4 (p. 6,14) *illa viniola . . . r e s i d i t in terraturium sancti illius.* Now it is true that *sedere* in classical times is used in a sense not far removed from that of *esse*, *situm esse* in statements of geographical or topographical facts,⁵ but it is usually restricted to the description of low-lying places. Cf. Pomp. Mela I 19,98 and II 2,24 (referring to localities on peninsulas); Silius Italicus VI 647 *latis in campis . . . s e d e t . . . Mevania*; XII 162 *campo Nola s e d e t.*⁶ More remarkable is Mela III 1,13 *tres arae, quas Sestianas vocant, in paeneinsula s e d e n t.* This again refers to a peninsula, which can hardly be a pure coincidence. Nevertheless the example is strikingly reminiscent of those cited above from medieval texts.

This weakened use of *sedere* occurs also in Medieval Latin, although hitherto

¹ Cf. GODEFROY, Dictionnaire s. v. *douter, doter*; VON WARTBURG, FEW, s. v. *dubitare* (also p. 170 n. 6, on Old Ital. *dottare* 'to fear', *dotta* 'fear'); TOBLER-LOMMATZSCH, Altfr. Wb. s. v. *doter*; APPEL, Provenzalische Chrestomathie (6. ed., 1930), p. 241 on *doftar, dubtar*, etc.

² On this word see my Peregr. Aeth. 112. In Christian Latin it often means 'miracle', but here it means 'object with miraculous properties'.

³ P. GEYER, Kritische und sprachliche Erläuterungen zu Antonini Placentini Itinerarium (Gymn.-Progr. Augsburg 1892), p. 11.

⁴ A more common use of *sedere* or *residere* is with a personal subject, meaning 'be situated' (*exercitus sedet*, etc., a classical usage, 'live', 'dwell', e. g., Peregr. Aeth. 20,5 of monks *qui in solitudine sedebant*; my commentary p. 146.

⁵ Cf. P. PERSSON, Eranos XIII, pp. 147 f.

⁶ BAXTER-JOHNSON notes *sedere in* 'to be situated in' from 1066 and 1086.

it has not to my knowledge been remarked by scholars. The most striking example I know is to be found in *Las Peregrinaciones a Santiago de Compostela*,¹ tom. III, p. 153 (end of twelfth century) *tabulam, que supra altare sedet retro, in qua imagines sunt ...* It is of particular interest that this expression should appear in a Spanish text, since in Spanish and Portuguese *sedere* becomes partly confounded with *esse* and takes over some of its meanings; cf. MEYER-LÜBKE II § 218; III § 397; MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, Orígenes § 73,3 (he notes also, § 72,1, that in *Glos. Siles. 72* *esse* is glossed as *sedere*, and was obviously no longer understood by those who only knew the spoken language). In other words the passage shows us a latinizing of an Old Spanish construction.

I shall add one further example analogous to those already given. It is well known that *sic* in the meaning 'yes', 'quite so' occurs in Terence (e. g., *Phormio* 316) and thereafter in Late and Medieval Latin. From it comes *si* (*si*) in Italian,² Spanish and some other Romance languages, cf. MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 7892. No comment is necessary therefore on such a passage as the following; *Historia S. Ursulae et soc.*, c. 12 (*Anal. Boll.* III, p. 14,28), a text of the tenth century: *Vir angelicae venustatis ... mellifluo an excubaret, perquirat affatu. Quae sic professa* (i. e. she said 'yes') *quis ... heros ille foret ... mirabatur*. For the modern French usage see MEYER-LÜBKE III § 547: *si* had various functions which have now disappeared, but it remains as an adversative affirmation in dialogue, e. g., *est-ce que vous n'allez pas à Paris? Si, j'y vais*. More peculiar is *dire que si* (as also *dire que oui*); the earliest examples given by GODEFROY are after a negative question: *les resolutions des Conciles n'auront elles nulle autorité? je respon que si* (Calvin); after a question without a negative: *je demanday s'il l'avoit veue de par là; il me dit que si* (Brantôme). But I think that this idiom is of considerably older date. It occurs in a Latinized form, e. g., in Étienne de Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques*³ (saec. XIII) p. 283 *quesivit ab episcopis, si hoc diceret Dominus; et ipsis respondentibus quod sic, ait: quomodo ergo vos super hoc ... dubitatis?* A further example can be found in the *Vita s. Ludovici episc. Tolosani*⁴ from the beginning of the fourteenth century, c. 43 (*Anal. Boll.* IX, p. 313, 25) *requisivit ab ea, si comedere vellet. Qua respondente quod sic,*

¹ Edited by VAZQUEZ DE PARGA, LACERRA and URÍO RÍU (Madrid 1948-49).

² Cf., e. g., L. SPITZER, *Italienische Umgangssprache* (Bonn 1922), p. 100.

³ Edited by A. LECOY DE LA MARCHE, Paris 1877.

⁴ Written by one Iohannes de Orta, of whom very little is known.

misit et fecit afferri de pane suo. The resemblance between this and the examples quoted by GODEFROY (particularly *je respon que si*) is too striking to have arisen from pure coincidence: here, as in many other cases in medieval texts, we meet in a Latin form the beginnings of a Romance construction, and we can trace it back further in this sphere than has hitherto been possible. Hence our knowledge not only of vulgar Late Latin,¹ but even of Medieval Latin is of great value towards a better understanding of the origins of Romance usages.

Another example in my opinion is *non obstante*. In Italian *non ostante* and in Spanish *no obstante* are often used without a following noun or pronoun, in the sense of 'nevertheless', as English *notwithstanding*. Thus we may find, e. g., Ital. *il quale oriundo d'Epiro, non ostante insegnava in latino*. On the development of this usage see the 'Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca' XI, pp. 744 f. The earliest example cited is from Lorenzo Lippi (1606–1665). But the usage, or at least the tendency towards it, is much older: cf., e. g., *Gesta Romanorum* ed. OESTERLEY, p. 625: *sed leo hoc videns non obstante in mare saltavit et post navem natabat. Rex vero hoc videns naute precepit ut eum introduceret*. Cf. Filippo Corsini: *tardarono non ostante a porsi in mare*.

The more we study Medieval Latin, the more clear does it become that there is an intimate connexion, first and foremost between it and the earlier stages of Latin, secondly between it and the development of the Romance languages. The various details considered in isolation may seem to be of little interest, but treated together they bear unmistakable witness to the continuity of development: a development that is not merely linguistic, but cultural in the widest sense. It has been truly said that it was Cicero more than any other man who created the language of philosophy, that is the language of conceptual thought, in Latin. But our picture remains very incomplete if we do not consider the influence also of the language of the Vulgate, the sermons of the Fathers, the wiredrawn distinctions of the theologians and metaphysicians. Only if we study the history of Latin as a whole, in which the final stages of the mighty process deserve as much attention as the beginning, shall we understand the deep significance of MEILLET'S words:² "Jusqu'au seuil de l'époque moderne, quiconque a pensé n'a pensé qu'en latin."

¹ Cf. above pp. 29 ff.

² Esquisse, p. 283 (in the brilliant chapter on the unity of Latin and its importance for western literature and culture).

CHAPTER V.

THE CHRISTIAN INFLUENCE

The dissemination and ultimate victory of Christianity in the Roman Empire was of epoch-making importance not only in the world of religion, but in the whole social and cultural field. The new system of thought called for and created not quite a new language, but certainly new forms of expression. Side by side with this movement went — slowly and gradually — an entire social revolution: it was the lower classes, the humble and neglected elements of society, among whom the Gospel first found whole-hearted acceptance.¹ It need not be emphasized that so profound a revolution must have left ineradicable traces in the history of the language; and indeed Christian Latin forms one of the most important phases in the long historical development of the Latin tongue. It has qualities which set it apart from Classical Latin on the one hand, and from the main body of Late Latin on the other: peculiarities which appear most clearly, as might be expected, in the field of lexicology and semantics. As for syntax, Christian Latin certainly possesses some peculiar expressions and constructions, which have been influenced by the language of the Scriptures — some of these we shall consider in the present chapter — but to speak of a Christian syntax would be on the whole a misuse of language.²

¹ Cf. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* V 1,15, on the language of the Bible: *Nam haec in primis causa est, cur apud sapientes et doctos et principes huius saeculi scriptura sancta fide careat, quod prophetae communi ac simplici sermone ut ad populum sunt locuti. Contemnuntur itaque ab iis qui nihil audire vel legere nisi expolitum ac disertum volunt.* — On the popular element in Christian Latin see also CHRISTINE MOHRMANN in *Vig. Christ.* II (1948), pp. 89 ff.

² See the well founded objections of MAROUZEAU in *REL* XIV, pp. 425 f.; XVI, p. 186; MEILLET, *Ling. hist.* I, p. 115: "Les langues spéciales, celles des métiers, celles des groupe-

That Christian Latin cannot simply be equated with Church Latin is a thesis that has been more than once maintained,¹ and has been restated with great vigour in recent years by the Dutch scholar Jos. SCHRIJNEN and his pupils, among whom CHRISTINE MOHRMANN holds a leading position. A representative expression of their views is to be found in the very learned and valuable series *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva* (Nijmegen 1932 ff.), which has made important contributions particularly to the study of the style of Cyprian and Augustine. The view of Christian Latin as a reflexion of social stratification, as a different language from that of profane authors, is to be found most clearly developed in two short studies: Jos. SCHRIJNEN, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Lateins* (*Latinitas Christ. Primaeva* I, 1932) and CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, *Quelques traits caractéristiques du latin des chrétiens* (in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, I).² For SCHRIJNEN (p. 25) the words 'Church Latin' signify, not unreasonably, the language of the church itself, that is to say, first and foremost the language of liturgy, of worship, secondly the language of the curia, the official style of church dignitaries; on p. 27 he appears to add to these the language of the Bible. On the language of the Early Christians in general — "die altchristliche Sondersprache," as he and his school call it — he observes on the other hand, after stressing the separatist tendency of which he adduces so many examples:

"Die Differenzierung ergab keinen besonderen Dialekt, denn es wird öfters betont, dass die Christen sich in ihrer Sprache von ihren Mitbürgern nicht unterscheiden. Aber sie schuf eine engere Sprachgemeinschaft, in der Archaismen sich erhalten und Neubildungen aufblühen konnten, in der Bedeutungs-differenzierungen und Entlehnungen an der Tagesordnung waren, in der dem Volkslatein aus praktischen Gründen Vorschub geleistet werden konnte, in der auch besondere Redensarten und morphologische und syntaktische

ments transitoires, celles même de la religion, ne se distinguent le plus souvent que par des vocables particuliers; le système général de la langue, caractérisé par la prononciation et par les formes grammaticales, reste un."

¹ See my *Syntactica* II, p. 458.

² *Studi e Testi* 121 (Città del Vaticano 1946). Among the various writings of Miss MOHRMANN, the following are especially worthy of notice: *Le latin commun et le latin des chrétiens* (*Vig. Christ.* I, pp. 1 ff.); *Les origines de la Latinité chrétienne à Rome* (*ibid.* III, pp. 67 ff.; 163 ff.). Her work is distinguished by depth of learning and clarity of exposition, although she seems to me to fall, as SCHRIJNEN does, into the error of exaggerating the peculiarities of Christian Latin and its claim to be a separate language ("eine Sondersprache"). See MAROUZEAU, *REL.* X, pp. 241 f.; XVI, pp. 185 f.

Eigentümlichkeiten gedeihen konnten, und in der insbesondere sich vielfache Differenzierungen entfalteten, die aus der Kultsprache entlehnt waren."

All this is very well put, and substantially true. The difficulties begin when we approach the concrete problems, both linguistic and literary. It is difficult and often impossible to specify the various elements which are drawn from colloquial language and from the language of Scripture and church to make the closely woven fabric of Christian Latin.¹ It is easy, for example, to exaggerate the vulgar element in the sermons of Augustine, as SCHRIJNEN does in a high degree — he even declares categorically that they are written in "Volkslatein" (p. 44). Certainly Augustine's style, as TH. DOKKUM and SNEYDERS DE VOGEL among others have pointed out,² shows an interesting and very gradual development from his earliest writings to the *Sermones*, in which the language is from some points of view less classical; and it is indeed true that the great preacher addresses his Christian congregation in a wonderfully simple, living, and natural style. Yet at the same time his language from the pulpit uses an extraordinary range of rhetorical figures, wordplays, metaphors, parallelism of clauses, and homoioteleuta.³ In fact Augustine belongs to that very large number of Christian authors who in theory proclaim the need for a simple style in writing and speaking, but do not practise what they preach.⁴ As an example of "das saftige, würzige altchristliche Volkslatein" SCHRIJNEN alleges (p. 12) the following passage from the *Sermones*, which I will quote, drawing attention to its highly artificial stylistic features:

Numquid adhuc opus habemus exerceri malis?
Numquid necesse habet aurum adhuc purgari per paleam?
Totus enim mundus fornax aurificis:
ibi iusti tamquam aurum,
ibi impii tamquam palea;
ibi tribulatio sicut ignis,

¹ Cf. DEVOTO, *Storia*, pp. 312 ff.

² References in SCHRIJNEN, pp. 9 f.

³ Cf. A. REGNIER, *De la latinité des Sermons de Saint Augustin* (Paris 1886), pp. 115 ff.; E. NORDEN, *Die antike Kunstprosa II*, pp. 621 ff.; A. WIFSTRAND, *Andlig talekonst* (Stockholm 1943), pp. 162 f.; Y. BRILLOTH, *Predikans historia* (Lund 1945), pp. 46 ff. — SCHRIJNEN's view is supported by Miss MOHRMANN in her in other respects valuable study: *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin I*, Nijmegen 1932 (see esp. p. 16).

⁴ See NORDEN, *Kunstprosa II*, p. 529.

*ibi Deus sicut aurifex.
Pius Deum laudat, aurum rutilat;
impius Deum blasphemat, palea fumat.*¹

Despite the concrete and realistic character of the metaphorical language, it is surely most misleading to describe such a passage, with its pronounced parallelism of structure and marked antitheses, as "Volkslatein". The matter is Christian, but the manner of presentation is in the direct stream of the classical and rhetorical tradition. We may well see here the influence also of the Pauline Epistles, an influence which Augustine himself admits (De civ. Dei XI 18), but it is well known that Paul himself was strongly influenced by classical models, notably the Stoic or Cynic diatribae.² Another passage, equally illuminating for the style of the Sermones, is the end of Serm. 199, 2, 3 (PL 38, 1028), which is cited by NORDEN³ following REGNIER:

*eo nascente superi novo honore claruerunt,
quo moriente inferi novo timore tremuerunt,
quo resurgente discipuli novo amore exarserunt,
quo ascendente caeli novo obsequio patuerunt.*

HOFMANN rightly observes (p. 8) that the Christian Fathers certainly attempt in their sermons to adapt themselves to the level of their hearers, and to speak to the people in the language of the people. But it is characteristic of Augustine, continues HOFMANN, that at the very moment when he enunciates this principle, he uses for the purpose a typical rhetorical figure, a paronomasia: *melius in barbarismo nostro vos intelligitis, quam in nostra disertitudine vos deserti eritis* (in Psalm. 36, serm. 3,6).

This does not mean, of course, that Augustine's sermons are to be considered purely as products of literary art; their language is, as we have said, often in the highest degree lively and natural. But they have nothing to do with "Volkslatein" in any normal sense, that is the language of everyday life.⁴

¹ Serm. 301,7,6 (PL 38, 1383).

² See, e. g., BULTMANN, *Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Göttingen 1910), pp. 74 ff.; BLASS-DEBRUNNER § 489 ff.

³ Op. cit. II, p. 622.

⁴ See the acute and penetrating analysis given by REGNIER in his Introduction, pp. VIII ff. — On antithesis, parallelism, and other rhetorical figures in a much later period see the recent work of CESARE SEGRE, *La sintassi del periodo nei primi prosatori Italiani* (Accad. dei Lincei, Memorie, ser. VIII, vol. IV, 2, 1952), p. 63, et passim (references to FARAL and others).

Just as the language of Christian sermons stands to a large extent in direct continuation of the Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition, albeit inspired by a new and totally different spirit, so in ordinary Christian Latin do we meet a certain number of expressions which in their new meaning or usage show so natural and unsought a connexion with the earlier profane language, that one would regard them as a further stage in development rather than a radically new phenomenon.¹ To elaborate an exact formula covering these changes — a formula which would always be open to different interpretations — seems to me not so useful, at least from the standpoint of linguistic history, as to point out a few specific examples which illustrate this side of the development of Christian Latin.² I have dealt with a number of such examples in some detail in my *Syntactica* II, ch. XV, and shall therefore content myself for the moment with a short enumeration of some of them, while referring the reader for further documentation to the chapter cited.

The notion of 'asking someone for something' is expressed in Latin not only by the well known type of construction *petere ab aliquo*, but by a whole range of synonyms such as *orare*, *rogare*, *precari*, *obsecrare*, *obtestari*, etc. The competition between these synonyms is very interesting to trace. The verb *orare*,³ which at first meant 'to talk' — cf. *orator*, *oratio* — became restricted in its use at a comparatively early period, and mainly confined to such stereotyped expressions as *oro atque obsecro*, *oro vos*, etc. In Vitruvius, for example, *oro* is never

¹ Much the same may be said of the Christian art of the early Middle Ages. It used to be held that the Christian faith created a new art in opposition to the classical tradition, and that this new creation became the basis of medieval art. But this view no longer holds the field: see especially B. SCHWEITZER, *Die spätantiken Grundlagen der mittelalterlichen Kunst*, Leipzig 1949; E. DINKLER, *Gnomon* 1950, pp. 412 f. The more recent writers emphasize that no sudden break or jump occurred in the development; the Christian faith did not create a new style "als gleichsam dem Glaubensgehalt adäquate Ausdrucksform" (DINKLER). SCHWEITZER declares roundly that "die unwiderrufliche Wendung der Kunst zum Mittelalter sich schon in der Antike vollzogen hat" (p. 17). Naturally there are new and powerful forces at work (SCHWEITZER pp. 6 ff.; 17 f.; 44), but their roots lie largely in the classical period.

² CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, *Quelques traits etc.*, p. 6 f., seems to think that my expression "Umprägung" instead of "Neupprägung" betokens an underestimate on my part of the "activité créatrice" of Christianity. This is a misunderstanding: I wished merely to state a fact of linguistic history which has not always received due attention. See also DEVORO, *Storia*, p. 322.

³ On the history of the verb see F. HEERDEGEN, *Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Semasiologie* III (Erlangen 1881); for its later development my *Peregr. Aeth.*, pp. 39 ff.

used, its functions being discharged by *rogare*, *petere*, *ambire*. In Petronius likewise it is not *orare* that is the normal verb of asking — it only occurs a couple of times¹ — but *rogare*, which occurs 31 times. In Pliny's letters the distribution, according to HEERDEGEN, is as follows: *orare* only 9 times (usually in such pleonastic formulae as *rogo oro*, *orare hortari iubere*, etc.), but *rogare* in this sense 100 times, *precari* 16 times, etc. It is against this background that we have to view the emergence of *orare* as the standard word for prayer in Christian contexts. When the new religion needed a special term for this notion of fundamental importance, it chose with a sure instinct the archaic, rather solemn, and in popular speech almost obsolete *orare* (*oratio*), which thus acquired a new and long-enduring life.

Some idea of the naturalness and continuity of this development may be gained, for example, by studying the usage of the younger Seneca. According to HEERDEGEN (p. 68) he uses *orare* relatively seldom: 19 times. Among these examples we find two of the old formula *oro atque obsecro*, a few of the common interjection *oro te*, *oro vos* with a following question or command; in all other cases the object of *orare* is *deos* or *deum* — a really striking anticipation of the use which became universal in Christian language.²

¹ Peregr. Aeth., p. 42.

² There are other respects also in which the Stoic philosophical language as found in Seneca to a certain degree parallels the developments in Christian Latin. VON WARTBURG (ZRPh, LXI, p. 146) rightly observes that the influence of the Stoa upon the Latin language was greater than is usually admitted: it shows itself, says he, "in mancher Beziehung als Wegbereiter der christlichen Gedankenwelt." A striking example is the use of *caro* "de corporis infirmitate et libidinibus" (Thes. L. Lat. III 484,51; 485,72 ff.). The antithesis between *caro* and *spiritus* (σάρξ and πνεῦμα) in Christian contexts is well known and universal, e. g., Itala, Ep. ad Galat. 5,17 *c a r o concupiscit adversus s p i r i t u m et spiritus adversus c a r n e m*. Some passages in Seneca are comparable, e. g., Ep. 74,16 *summum bonum in a n i m o contineamus . . . Non est summa felicitatis nostrae in c a r n e ponenda*; the same antithesis in Ep. 65,22; Dial. VI 24,5 *omne illi* (sc. *a n i m o*) *cum hac gravi c a r n e certamen est*. But *carnalis* occurs only in Christian writers (from Tertullian onwards). — The use of *captivus* is interesting. In Christian writers we often find such expressions as *c a p t i v u s impudicitiae libidinisque*, *c a p t i v u s concupiscentiae*, etc. (Thes. L. Lat. III 373,58 ff.). VON WARTBURG cites from Seneca (copying from the Thesaurus) Dial. V 4,4 *irae suae c a p t i v u s*. The mss. indeed give *captus*, not *captivus*, but even if this were right (LÖFSTEDT, Zur Sprache Tertullians, pp. 4 f.), the resemblance to the Christian mode of expression is none the less striking. From this usage develops the later employment of *captivus* without a genitive to signify 'wretched', 'unhappy', 'miserable', anticipating more or less clearly the usage of Romance languages, cf. Fr. *chétif*, etc.; even 'wicked', cf. It. *cattivo*, etc. There are good examples in

We may also note two scholia on Cicero, Div. in Caec. 3 (Cic. Or. Schol. ed. STANGL 188,6) *rogare ut hominem, orare ut deos*; 324,15 *rogamus homines, oramus deos*.

The use of *gentes* to denote 'the heathen' is widespread and deserving of notice.¹ In order fully to understand the origin of this usage, we must examine closely the development of the shades of meaning in the word in classical and postclassical times. In profane Latin authors we several times find *gentes* used to signify 'strangers', 'barbarians', or 'provincials' — an idiom which has not always received due attention. We often find an exact antithesis between *populus Romanus* on one side and *gentes* on the other. Thus Cicero, De orat. II 18, 76: *qui (i. e. Hannibal) cum populo Romano omnium gentium victore certasset*; Pro Plancio 4, 11 *huius principis populi et omnium gentium domini atque victoris*. Here both nouns are qualified by an epithet, but the latter soon comes to be omitted in one or both cases, and the antithesis *populus—gentes* becomes a standard τόπος. So for example Sallust, Orat. Lepidi 11 *populus Romanus, paulo ante gentium moderator*; Livy V 48, 8 (the Brennus episode) *mille pondo auri pretium populi gentibus mox imperaturi factum*; Plin. Paneg. 51, 3 *digna populo victore gentium sedes*; an essentially similar expression is put into the mouth of Caesar in Bell. Hisp. 17, 3 *qualem gentibus me praestiti, similem in civium deditione praestabo* (where NIPPERDEY posits a lacuna before *gentibus* and a few later critics insert *alienis*). This antithesis is particularly favoured by the patriotic Florus, e. g., I 44, 3 *victor gentium populus*; II 1, 2 *populus gentium victor orbisque possessor*, etc. A similar use of *gentes* occurs in Lucan I 465 (see HOUSMAN's note); Seneca N. Q. V 18, 14 (altered by several critics); Tacitus Germ. 33; Ann. VI 33 *more gentico* 'in a barbarian fashion'; in the same sense Amm. Marc. XVIII 2, 13 *epulis ad usque vigiliam tertiam gentili more extentis*. For Late Latin in general see my Syntactica II, pp. 466 f.; MOMMSEN's Index to Jordanes p. 188; KLEBS in FRIEDLÄNDER's Juvenal p. 604.

A striking and hitherto unnoticed example of this tendency to call one's

SALONIUS p. 365; THÖRNELL, *Studia Tertulliana* III (Upps. Univ. Årsskr. 1922), pp. 27 f.; PETSCHENIG, *Corippus*, p. 234; MORIN, *Études, textes, découvertes* I (Maredsous 1913), p. 381; MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 1663; VON WARTBURG, FEW II, p. 332. — It is greatly to be desired that a detailed analysis of the language of Roman Stoicism should be made from this point of view.

¹ Detailed study in Syntactica II, pp. 464 ff., résumé in MOHRMANN, *Quelques traits*, p. 6.

own or the nearest people *populus*, the more remote *gentes*, comes from an Irish source at the end of the seventh century: Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbae* III 23 *non tantum Scotorum reges cum populis, sed etiam barbararum et exterarum gentium regnatores*.

Gentes then, when placed antithetically to *populus* or *populus Romanus* signifies 'foreigners', 'barbarians', a meaning which was of course strongly pejorative in tone. Hence when we find *gentes* from the earliest Fathers onwards signifying 'the heathen' this is only a simple and natural transference of this usage into a religious context. The development of the Greek counterpart *ἔθνη* was strikingly similar: in the pre-Christian language, as for example in Attic inscriptions of c. 150 B.C., it is applied to foreigners, in the Christian writers, to the heathen (PREUSCHEN-BAUER, *Griech.-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Test.*, 2. ed., p. 338). Similarly the Hebrew original *gojîm* means sometimes peoples outside Israel, sometimes the heathen. Accordingly *ἔθνη* also can be used of foreigners in respect of Israel, as can *gentes*; cf. Thes. L. Lat. VI: 2, 1849, 77 ff.; Vulg. Deut. 32, 43 *laudate, gentes, populum eius* (in the Septuagint *ἔθνη . . . τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*). To the few examples given in Thes. L. Lat. may be added Theod. Mops. in Psalm. 9, p. 56,5 ff. (*Studi e Testi* 93). The adjective *gentilis* is also deserving of notice. On its fortunes in the Romance languages RHEINFELDER remarks in his comprehensive and valuable study 'Kultsprache und Profansprache',¹ p. 131: "Dieses Wort ist in gelehrtem, biblischem Gebrauch noch erhalten in ital. *i Gentili*, frz. *les Gentils*: das sind die Nichtisraeliten, wenn von den Zeiten des Alten Testaments gesprochen wird; vom christlichen Standpunkt aus, die Heiden." Finally we may mention Eng. *gentile*, which sometimes means non-Jewish, sometimes non-Christian.

A well-known and widespread synonym of *gentilis* is *paganus*, which has left derivatives in all the Romance languages.² The origin of this usage has been much disputed, and the two most important studies date back to the sixteenth century. One, which in our time has claimed the support of ZEILLER,³ derives it from the adjective *paganus* 'rustic', 'unlettered' in contrast to *urbanus*. Thus *paganus* would originally have been used of villagers, country-folk, and after the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the state,

¹ HANS RHEINFELDER, *Kultsprache und Profansprache in den romanischen Ländern*, Geneva and Florence 1933 (*Biblioteca dell' Archivum Romanicum*, Ser. II, Vol. 18).

² In late Greek also we find an adjective *παγανός*; see PREISIGKE and SOPHOCLES, also DU CANGE, *Gloss. Gr.* 1075; cf. also next page, note 6.

³ J. ZEILLER, *Paganus. Étude de terminologie historique*, Fribourg-Paris 1917.

when heathendom was confined to the country districts or *pagi*, the heathen were called *pagani* to denote their low cultural level.¹

This view cannot be dismissed out of hand. ZEILLER, whose work is of great value as a collection of the relevant material,² refers us i. a. to Orosius, who writes to Augustine c. 418 thus (Hist. adv. pag. I, Prol. 9): *praeceperas mihi, uti adversus vaniloquam pravitatem eorum, qui alieni a civitate Dei ex locorum agrestium compitis et pagis pagani vocantur sive gentiles, quia terrena sapiunt* ... Despite the objections of SCHULZE,³ the natural and immediate interpretation is that Orosius is consciously deriving *paganus* from *pagus*, and takes its original meaning to be *agrestis* or *rusticus*; although admittedly in compliment to his correspondent he introduces the antithesis between *civitas Dei* and *civitas terrena*, with a further reference perhaps to the old *compitalia* and *paganalia*. This view is further supported by some passages of Prudentius, who in his poem Contra Symmachum (I 449) inveighs against the pagan representations of the gods as follows: *sint haec barbaricis gentilia numina pagis*. In two passages he uses *pagus* in the sense of *paganismus*: Perist. X 296 *stulte, pago dedite* (ibid. 1009 *miserrime pagane*); C. Symm. I 619 *pago implicitos* ... viros.

That the basis for such expressions was the representation of paganism as a religion of rustics can scarcely be denied, but — and this is an important reservation — it does not follow that this interpretation perfectly reflects the true origin and development of *paganus* = 'heathen', of which an intermediate stage is visible in some passages of Tertullian, which will be quoted later. Indeed it is apparent from the confused and conflicting accounts given by Filastrius, Div. haer. 111 (p. 75 MARX), that the theologians themselves at the end of the fourth century were not sure of the true meaning of *paganus*. Accordingly our prospects of arriving at a perfectly convincing solution to the problem are rather uncertain, and possibly no such solution can be reached without fresh material from the earliest period of Christian Latin literature. Nevertheless, the following explanation, supported in our day by ZAHN⁴ and ALTANER,⁵ and starting from the earlier use of *paganus* to mean 'civilian' as opposed to *miles*,⁶ at least deserves careful consideration.

¹ WISSOWA, Religion und Kultus der Römer, 2. ed., p. 100.

² See also his remarks in Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscr. et belles-lettres, 1940, pp. 526 ff.

³ WILHELM SCHULZE, Kleine Schriften (1933), p. 520.

⁴ Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift X (1899), pp. 18 ff.

⁵ Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte LVIII (1939), pp. 130 ff.

⁶ In certain inscriptions we find a characteristic use of *paganus* (παγανός) in reference

As early as Tacitus this antithesis occurs frequently and unmistakably. There are seven places in which *pagani* means purely and simply 'the local population', 'the civil population', e. g., Hist. I 53 *inter paganos corruptior miles*. Cf. HERAEUS' note: "*pagani* ... im Gegensatz zu *miles* von der Zivilbevölkerung. S. Veget. Epit. r. mil. II 23 *si doctrina cesset armorum, nihil paganus distat a milite*. Plin. Ep. VII 25; X 86 B (18) *et milites et pagani*. Suet. Aug. 27; Galb. 19. Iuv. XVI 33." The eighth example is rather different, but perhaps even more illustrative of this nuance: Tac. Hist. III 24 *mox infensius praetorianis 'vos', inquit, 'nisi vincitis, pagani'* (contemptuously, roughly 'civilians', 'shopkeepers'). Juvenal only uses *paganus* once, XVI 33, and here again there is an antithesis implied between civil and military rank, cf. MAYOR or FRIEDLÄNDER ad loc. The same holds good of Tertullian, cf. De pallio 4 and particularly De corona 11. This fact is of especial interest: certainly one can hardly maintain that *paganus* at this early date means 'heathen',¹ but its appearance in a context calling to mind the 'soldiers of Christ' marks an important stage in the development of the meaning,² for it is in all probability this image of the Christian as a *miles Christi*³ which in the long run proved decisive among the Fathers. In the impassioned language of St. Paul (Ep. ad Eph., 6, 12 ff.) the Christian is in conflict with the world and the powers of evil, and in contrast with them the heathen are — in a contemptuous expression borrowed from the barrack-room — designated: *pagani* 'non-combatants', 'civilians'. They are in HARNACK'S words⁴

to a gladiator's previous (civilian) name or to the name which he bore after his dismissal, which was often presumably the same as the former. See J. KEIL, Anzeiger d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse 79 (Jahrg. 1942), pp. 84 ff. He cites *παγανός* in this meaning from an interesting Greek inscription from Bithynia (probably second century of the Christian era); cf. next page, note 1.

¹ This is illustrated by the much disputed sentence *apud hunc (sc. Iesum) tam miles est paganus fidelis, quam paganus est miles fidelis* (De cor. 11, p. 177,42 KROYMANN). Cf. OEHLER I p. 445; MOHRMANN, Quelques traits, p. 7. The interpretation of ALTANER (p. 133) is clever rather than convincing.

² SCHMECK, Vig. Christ. V (1951), p. 140.

³ On the notion '*miles Christi*' and kindred ideas see HARNACK, Militia Christi (Tübingen 1905), passim (p. 68 on Tert. De cor. 11); E. EIDEM, Pauli bildvärld, I: Athletae et milites Christi (Lund 1913); SKARD, Vexillum virtutis, Symb. Osl. XXV (1947), pp. 26 ff.

⁴ Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums I⁴, pp. 430 f. — A rather different, and far from convincing, explanation is given by SAINIO, Semasiologische Untersuch. über die Entstehung d. christl. Latinität (Helsinki 1940), pp. 96 ff. He holds, without sufficient documentation, that the *pagani* were an unprivileged group in relation to the military and

"Leute, die Gott bzw. Christo den Fahneneid (*sacramentum*) nicht geleistet, also am Sakrament nicht Anteil haben, d.h. Zivilisten, also *pagani*." Besides HARNACK's brilliant exposé, cf. TEEUWEN, Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian, pp. 106 ff. on military expressions and images in Tertullian. Here also, as so often, Christian linguistic usage can be shown to have deep roots in the earlier profane idiom.¹

A striking 'christianisme sémasiologique' is *confiteor* (*confessio*, *confessor*) in a pregnant, religious sense. A clear and detailed treatment of the relevant questions is given by RHEINFELDER, op. cit., pp. 101 ff.;² cf. also CHR. MOHRMANN's short study, Quelques traits, pp. 10 ff. Such expressions as *confiteri delicta*, *peccata*, etc. are perfectly natural in Classical Latin, but it is the absolute use of *confiteri* (*confessio*) in the same sense that is characteristic of Christian Latin. This development seems to have occurred relatively late. In the oldest Christian authors the Greek loanword *exomologesis* is the usual expression denoting confession of sins. It is used by Cyprian and Tertullian in this sense: cf. Tertullian, De paenitentia 9,2 *is actus, qui magis Graeco vocabulo exprimitur et frequentatur, exomologesis est, qua delictum Domino nostrum confitemur*. Little by little, perhaps during the third century, the loanword was replaced by the pure Latin *confessio*, *confiteor*³ and subsequently disappears, as it seems, from ordinary use.

In the first centuries of the Christian era *confiteri* and *confessio* were applied

official classes. "Zu einer solchen wurden auch die Anhänger des alten Glaubens, nachdem das Christentum von Konstantin zur Staatsreligion erhoben war und die alten Kulte schliesslich gänzlich verboten wurden." The origin of the name, according to this theory, would have to be sought in the field of private law.

¹ The explanation given above cannot be considered as certain, and the discussion will no doubt continue. Recently CHRISTINE MOHRMANN (Vig. Christ. VI, pp. 109 ff.) has proposed a new explanation, derived from another meaning of *paganus*: "le particulier, celui qui n'appartient pas à un groupe défini, le *ιδιώτης* grec." I cannot think that the evidence she adduces for this meaning is adequate — she herself admits that it is a very rare meaning. She bases her view mainly on the gladiator-inscriptions mentioned above (p. 76, note 6), where the *ὄνομα παγανόν* is simply the civilian name of the relevant person, and on a passage of Ulpian (Dig. XI 4,3), where *paganus* probably means 'peasant' or 'farmer' ('Landmann', HEUMANN-SECKEL). Equally irrelevant to her attempted demonstration is the passage of Persius, Prol. 6 *semipaganus*. But her objections to the theories hitherto held are clearly set out and deserve attention.

² Some slight additions and modifications are given by the author himself in Die Sprache, Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft I (Wien 1949), pp. 56 ff.

³ On the derivatives of *confiteor* in the Romance languages (Fr. *confesser ses péchés*, It. *peccato confessato*, *mezzo perdonato*, etc.) see RHEINFELDER p. 107.

more usually to a declaration of faith: cf., e. g., *Passio Perp. et Fel. 6,2 interrogati ceteri confessi sunt*. But since in the primitive church such a declaration was liable to be punished by death, *confessio* came also to signify martyrdom, occasionally — perhaps towards the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century — the place where a martyr bore witness and suffered, or sometimes the place where he was buried, cf. Cassiod. Var. XI 2,6 (A.D. 533) *confessiones illas, quas videre universitas appetit, Roma felicius in suis sinibus habere promeruit*. The same sense of 'martyr's grave' is retained by It. *confessione*, as RHEINFELDER remarks (p. 103), in the Rome of today: "Man bezeichnet mit *confessione* (häufig gebraucht man auch das lat. *confessio*) den Platz in der Kirche über dem Grabe des Heiligen, besonders eines Märtyrers." RHEINFELDER goes into further detail, touching also the use of *confessor* and *martyr*.

But there is yet a third meaning of *confiteri* in Christian Latin, namely 'praise', 'extol': cf., e. g., Vulg., Matth. 11,25 *confiteor tibi, Pater, domine caeli et terrae, quia abscondisti haec a sapientibus et prudentibus et revelasti ea parvulis* (the Greek text has ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι . . .); Psalm. 144,10 *confiteantur tibi, Domine, omnia opera tua* (ἐξομολογησάσθωσαν σοι . . .); likewise in the Te Deum: *Te Deum laudamus, te Dominum confitemur*, where the two expressions are virtually synonymous. Further exx. in Thes. L. Lat. IV 231,1 ff. (object in dative or accusative). This peculiar usage is entirely a Hebraism, through the medium of Greek ἐξομολογεῖσθαι: the corresponding Hebrew word meaning (RHEINFELDER pp. 101 f.) both 'admit' or 'declare', and 'praise'. The translators, first into Greek, then into Latin, kept the same verb for both meanings, Greek ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, Latin *confiteri*, which properly can only represent the one.¹ But since this use of *confiteri* was completely unnatural, it died out later, and has left no traces in the Romance tongues.

The semantic development of *refrigerium* and *refrigerare* can interest both the psychologist and the ecclesiastical historian. The question is discussed by SCHRIJNEN, Charakteristik, pp. 39 f.; P. DE LABRIOLLE, Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes 1912, pp. 214 ff.; A. M. SCHNEIDER, Refrigerium I (Diss. Freiburg in Breisgau 1928). In profane authors *refrigerare* simply means 'to cool'; in Christian literature it and its cognate *refrigerium* also refer to 'refreshment', 'life eternal', 'everlasting blessedness'.² Thus in

¹ For an important parallel see below p. 53.

² In an interesting and scholarly study (Mnemosyne, Ser. III, vol. 3, pp. 125 ff.) VAN DER LEEUW tries to show that the ideas behind this use of *refrigerium* were of Egyptian origin. But LABRIOLLE l. c. takes a different view. The question is one for the comparative hierologist, and I am not competent to judge it.

DIEHL, Inscr. 2319 *refrigeres, dulcis*; 2320 *filiae dulcissimae, cuius spiritum in refrigerium suscipiat Dominus*. But we find it also in the sense of 'love-feast', *agape*: thus Tert. Ad scap. 4 (OEHLER I 549) *pupillos pie tractamus, indigentibus refrigeramus*. The giving of food to martyrs before torture is also referred to by the verb *refrigerare* (cf., e. g., Pass. Perp. et Fel. 3; 8; 16). Again *refrigerium* can mean the supper in commemoration of one dead, or in honour of certain martyrs, as Peter and Paul. Thus in a graffito in the grave of the Apostles ad Catacumbas (San Sebastiano), DIEHL 1565 *Petro et Paulo Tomius Coelius refrigerium feci*.¹ The origins of this development lie in the Christian cult, but how far it can be considered, as SCHRIJNEN p. 40 considers it, as "typisch für den vulgären Einschlag der altchristlichen Sondersprache," is quite another question.² It has no traces in Romance, as is well known, and the wiser course is to avoid this excessively wide application of the term 'vulgar', a practice which belongs to an outmoded school of research.

Closely related in meaning to *refrigerium* is *pax*, which in the early church is a most important and widely employed word, occurring constantly in most diverse meanings. A detailed analysis of the different uses is given in TEEUWEN, op. cit. pp. 49–68. It is not necessary to go into all the details: a few salient points suffice for our purposes. The original meaning of peace, as opposed to war, lends itself readily to the Christian use of the word for being at peace with the state, enjoying freedom from persecution.³ Its meaning also extends to 'peace with God', 'peace in God', *pax Dei* as St. Paul calls it (Phil. 4, 7); hence Christians call themselves *filiis pacis* and speak of death as *in pace dormire*.⁴ The Christian communion is also referred to as *pax*, and the term is used when speaking of a sinner's return to the fold, and to membership in the fraternity of worship. From this idea is derived the use of *pax* to mean 'kiss', which at first appears somewhat strange. In the primitive church it was customary for the members during the service, *habita oratione*, cf. Tert. De or. 18, to give each other a fraternal kiss (*osculum sanctum* or simply *osculum*) as a token of their spiritual unity. This kiss came to be called *osculum pacis*

¹ Cf. H. LIETZMANN, Petrus und Paulus in Rom (2. ed.), pp. 164 ff. On the problem of the grave of the Apostles see also A. M. SCHNEIDER, Die Memoria Apostolorum an der Via Appia (Nachrichten der Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1951, Nr. 3).

² To SCHRIJNEN's mind *refrigerium* is "ein rassiges Volkswort"!

³ On Tertullian's attitude towards this kind of *pax* see TEEUWEN p. 50.

⁴ On this expression see TEEUWEN pp. 52 f.

or simply *pax*.¹ The usage, at first purely ecclesiastical, became wider spread, and *pax* was applied generally to a kiss of greeting between near kinsfolk or fellow-Christians. It is not without interest in this connexion that *phōc* (from *pacem*) in Old Irish means 'kiss', a usage which can thus be traced back to the language of the earliest Christian communities.

I shall not here go further into the extraordinarily numerous expressions belonging to the Christian doctrine, cult, and organization, etc., of which no small number is made up of Greek loanwords (sometimes of Hebraisms disguised as Greek). All these words — *angelus*, *apostolus*, *ecclesia*, *episcopus*, *evangelium*, *sacramentum*, *scandalizare*, and the like — which play a great and important part in the later development of Latin, have often been the subject of detailed researches (see the works cited above p. 69, although there is still room for more study.² Instead I shall draw attention to some phenomena which have attracted less notice, namely cases in which words and expressions originally derived from Biblical Latin have exercised a remarkably profound influence on Medieval Latin or on the Romance languages. The exact course of development is not always simple, but it is here that the interest of the question lies.

It is well known that the Latin *parabola* is the original of a series of the most important Romance terms meaning 'word': Prov. *paraula*, Fr. *parole*, It. *parola*, etc. (MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 6221); likewise *parabolare* begets Prov. *paraular*, Fr. *parler*, It. *parlare*, etc. Yet Latin *parabola*, as used from Seneca and Quintilian, means not 'word' but 'simile' or 'comparison', as in the amusing anecdote of Quintilian's (VI 3,59): *adhibetur autem similitudo interim palam, interim inseri solet parabola e; cuius est generis illud Augusti, qui militi libellum timide porrigenti, 'noli', inquit, 'tamquam assem elephanto des'*. So far as I know, the meaning 'word' is not found in antiquity;³ in Hist. Apollonii 41 *si enim parabolarum mearum nodos absolveris*, the reference is to likeness in the form of riddles and KLEBS⁴ goes astray in taking the meaning simply as

¹ On liturgical formulae which have helped in this development — *do tibi pacem*, etc. — cf. TEEUWEN p. 65. On *pax vobiscum* and similar expressions in other languages cf. NYROP, *Linguistique et histoire des mœurs* (Paris 1934), pp. 32 ff.; CHR. MOHRMANN, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 f.

² That liturgical, and sacral Latin in general, has not been sufficiently studied has recently been emphasized by W. DÜRIG, *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* I (1951), pp. 32 ff. Thus *missa* meaning 'mass' is of disputed origin; see FR. ELPIDIUS, *Pax*, in: *Die Sprache* I, pp. 87 ff.

³ My ignorance is shared by the Thesaurus-bureau.

⁴ E. KLEBS, *Die Erzählung von Apollonius aus Tyrus* (Berlin 1899), p. 270.

'words'. In Medieval Latin the situation is different. In the *Glossae Remigianae*, published by PITRÆ, *Spicilegium Solesmense I* (Paris 1852), p. 504, we find: *seditiosus, id est qui rixas vel dissensiones vel iniurias exercet, nec non qui dicitur in rustica parabola ...* The end of the sentence is unfortunately missing, but the meaning is clearly 'in popular language', 'in the vulgar tongue'. Further examples are given by DU CANGE, who cites from Hesso Scholasticus: *assumpta parabola sua¹ respondit episcopus*. Sometimes it means 'permission' or 'command', as for example in the *Translatio S. Viti Mart.*: *deque licentia, parabola, auctoritate et mandato praefati d. episcopi publicavit*.

The verb *parabolare* 'to talk' is attested only in medieval sources. From the material given by DU CANGE we may quote from the *Capitula Caroli Calvi*: *nostri seniores, sicut audistis, parabolaverunt simul et consideraverunt cum communibus illorum fidelibus de Dei servitio*; or from the *Visio S. Baronti* 1: *coepit eum bis terque appellare; sed ille nihil homini valuit parabolare, sed digito gulam ei monstrabat*.

These are the facts then: how are we to explain them? I feel that the true explanation is probably that advanced by WACKERNAGEL in a brilliant treatment of the subject (*Idg. Forsch.* XXXI, pp. 262 ff.). He rightly makes the Greek *παραβολή* his starting point. This word both in Ionic-Attic and in koinè signified 'comparison' — leaving aside a few special uses that do not concern us — just as *παραβάλλειν* meant 'place alongside', 'compare'; it did not mean 'word'. WACKERNAGEL considers it impossible by any normal semantic process that a word meaning 'comparison' could come to mean 'word', and he finds the clue to the solution of the difficulty in the translating technique of the authors of the Septuagint. In the latter we find *παραβολή* sometimes in its classical sense of 'comparison', as *Ezech. 17,2*, but much more commonly in meanings that are not otherwise attested. It may, for instance, mean 'proverb', as *I Reg. 10,12* *διὰ τοῦτο ἐγενήθη εἰς παραβολήν, Ἡ καὶ Σαουλ ἐν προφήταις*; where the Vulgate has: *versum est in proverbium*. Again it may mean 'sentence', 'gnome', 'liedartiger Spruch' (WACKERNAGEL), 'speech', as *Num. 23,7* *καὶ ἀναλαβὼν τὴν παραβολὴν αὐτοῦ εἶπεν*, where the Vulgate also has: *assumptaque parabola sua dixit*; A. V. and R. V. "he took up his parable," but the Swedish version has: "då hov han upp sin röst och kvad." WACKERNAGEL renders: "da trug er seinen Spruch vor und sprach." For further examples see WACKERNAGEL p. 263.

¹ The expression seems to me to be modelled on Vulg., *Num. 23,7* (see below) and similar passages.

The explanation of all these usages lies in the peculiar methods adopted by the Seventy in translating from the Hebrew. Nothing is more common, says WACKERNAGEL, than for them to render all the meanings of a given Hebrew word by one and the same Greek word, regardless of the fact that the Greek word can properly bear only a few of those meanings. Consequently, according to WACKERNAGEL, they have "vielen griechischen Wörtern zu Bedeutungen verholfen, die ihnen sonst völlig fremd waren, und zu denen sie von sich aus nie gelangen konnten." He gives a number of convincing examples on pp. 263 ff.,¹ partly basing himself upon the work of such Biblical scholars as THIERSCH, RAHLFS, and SMEND. By a process of this sort the Greek παραβολή was made to take all the meanings of the Hebrew *māšāl*, simply because it shared with it the meaning 'comparison' or 'likeness'.

Christian Latin took over the word in this greatly extended range of meanings. The Biblical instances are very numerous in which it appears simply transliterated into *parabola*. Jerome does sometimes use *proverbium* where the Septuagint has παραβολή (cf. I Reg. 10,12 quoted above), and he by no means makes a rule of rendering it by *parabola*, but his practice largely coincides with that of his Greek predecessors in LXX. It is remarkable, says WACKERNAGEL, that he sometimes uses it to represent the Hebrew *māšāl* even where παραβολή was not used in the Septuagint. Thus the Book of Proverbs, called by the Seventy Παροιμίας Σαλωμώντος receives from him the Latin title *Parabola e Salomonis*. Cf. also Iob 27,1 ἔτι δὲ προσθεὶς Ἰωβ εἶπεν τῷ παροιμίᾳ, where the Vulgate has: *addidit quoque Iob, assumens parabolam suam, et dixit* (A. V. "taking up his parable", Swedish version "hov upp sin röst och kvad"); cf. 29,1; likewise Is. 14,4 λήμψη τὸν θρόνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος, but in the Vulgate: *sumes parabolam istam contra regem Babylonis*. So firmly established had the word become in its new meanings.² From the Biblical usage *parabola* meaning 'word' spread, not to the great Christian authors (see WACKERNAGEL p. 266), but to the everyday speech of the Christian congregations.

So it comes about, concludes WACKERNAGEL, that a living and widespread

¹ To these may be added the example discussed above p. 79.

² In the meaning 'gossip', 'scandal', '*materia irrisionis*' — a meaning sufficiently attested in the Old Testament — *parabola* finds employment even in the more literary works of the Middle Ages; cf. GERTZ, *Vitae Sanctorum Danorum* p. 306,24; *Scriptores minores hist. Dan. medii aevi* II 147,24. On παραβολή in this sense see WACKERNAGEL p. 263.

group of words, not merely occurring universally in the Romance tongues, but also finding its place as loanwords in other languages, owes its origin to a peculiarity in the technique of certain translators from Hebrew into Greek — a striking illustration of how in the history of language development does not always take place along straight and apparently natural lines. “Im geschichtlichen Leben ist alles voll Bastardtum.”

As I have said, I believe that this explanation is the true one, or at least draws attention to a vital factor in the development. Possibly also the fact that the language of Our Lord consisted so largely of simile and allegory, made possible in the mind of the masses such a semantic development as that from ‘simile’ to ‘speech’ or ‘word’.

There is another peculiar usage, discussed in my *Syntactica* II, pp. 266 f.; 491, which has received little attention, but which is none the less interesting. In the Latin of the Bible, especially in the Old Testament, and with peculiar frequency in certain of its books, we find an expression of protestation or asseveration of a remarkable type. For example I Reg. 29, 6 has: *vivit Dominus, quia rectus es tu*; IV Reg. 5, 20 *vivit Dominus, quia curram post eum*; with *quoniam* instead of *quia*, e. g., I Reg. 26, 16 *vivit Dominus, quoniam filii mortis estis vos*; less frequently with *quod*, as IV Reg. 3, 14. Many other examples are given in *Syntactica* l. c.; from the language of the Vulgate the formula spread to other Christian texts, particularly those of a more vulgar character. It is worthy of notice that it comes to light also in Medieval Latin texts.¹

One does not need to be a professional student of syntax to perceive that constructions of this type — “The Lord liveth, that I shall follow after him” — cannot have a genuine original in Latin.² In fact they are directly copied

¹ Cf. *Vita S. Melaniae jun.* I 28 (Anal. Boll. VIII, p. 39,11; the oldest ms., according to the editors, dates from the eighth century); *Johannes Monachus* (c. A.D. 1000), *Liber de miraculis*, ed. HUBER (SMT 7), pp. 30,24; 58,2; 82,16. Exceptionally in a profane context, *Liber Hist. Franc.* (eighth cent.) MGH, Mer. II, p. 259,3 *vivit dominus meus Chlodoveus rex et Franci, qui cum eo sunt, quia non timeo minas tuas*.

² We are on slightly different ground with some other asseverative formulae, as *per salutem Caesaris, quia . . .*; *per virtutem deorum, quia . . .*, etc., on which see my *Syntactica* l. c.; *ibid.* p. 268 for *vere quia, sane quia*, etc. For their continuance in the Romance languages see TOBLER, *Verm. Beitr.* I, pp. 59 ff., MEYER-LÜBKE III § 659. No doubt they contributed considerably to the spread of the constructions in question, but these latter form a special class and have an origin of their own.

from the corresponding expressions in the Septuagint: ζῆ Κύριος ὅτι, etc. In a special class, where the subordinate clause is denied, the Greek text uses εἰ, as I Reg. 19,6 *vivit Dominus, quia non occidetur*, where LXX has ζῆ Κύριος, εἰ ἀποθανεῖται. But the expression is equally far from home in Greek: in the Septuagint it is a pure Hebraism, ὅτι corresponding to the Hebrew *kī*, and εἰ to Heb. *īm*.

It is particularly interesting to find this construction alive in the Romance languages, at any rate in Spanish. TOBLER, who did not recognise the Hebraism in Greek and Latin upon which it was modelled, quotes from Calderón: *Vive Dios, que non he salido* (TOBLER, Verm. Beitr. I, p. 61). In modern authors the same construction survives, e. g., Alarcón, *El sombrero de tres picos*, p. 166: *Vive Dios, que los duendes se están despachando esta noche*.¹ I am not aware of any examples from Old Spanish — they would certainly be of the greatest interest. But at all events the main lines of the development are clear, and furnish an example of the often surprising ways in which linguistic history is made. A construction that was originally confined to Hebrew is imitated by the authors of the Septuagint, and from there is copied into Biblical Latin. Supported by some expressions more or less analogous,² it spreads by way of Late popular and Medieval Latin to establish itself in at least one and very probably more of the Romance languages.

I pass on to another striking idiom, which, although it is more limited in its range and after-effects than the preceding, still deserves our attention. In the more vulgar Late Latin texts and in the early Middle Ages we find the compound adverb *per ter* instead of the simple *ter* 'thrice' — a usage which remained long unnoticed. In order to give a tolerably clear picture of this usage I shall quote all examples known to me. In the *Actus Petri cum Simone*, a composition of the fifth or sixth century, there occurs (c. 28; p. 75,31 LIPSIVS)³ a passage which should in my opinion be read as follows: *accessit Simon ad caput mortui, et inclinans se per ter, erigens se ostendit populo elevasse caput et agitare* (sc. *mortuum*). The parallels which I shall adduce will show that there is no need to discuss the proposed emendations of USENER and BONNET, nor the false punctuation of the passage given by LIPSIVS; cf. Plin. Sec. Medicina p. 89,17 (ROSE), where among other

¹ I am informed by PASQUALI that *vivaddio che* is a common expression in modern Italian; what the situation is in older Italian I do not know.

² See preceding page, note 2.

³ *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* I.

treatments for a quartan fever we find: *item panem et salem in linteo de licio alliget et circa arborem licio alliget et adiuret per ter panem et salem*. So the best manuscripts;¹ and the reading is confirmed, as HERAEUS remarks,² by some formulae of incantation in HEIM's *Incantamenta magica*: p. 563, 1 *hoc per ter vicibus faciat* (HEIM reads *ter per vices*); ib. p. 476, no. 39 (from Theodore Priscian) *dicito intra te per te(r): diacholon, diacholon, diacholon* (so HERAEUS, correctly; HEIM reads: *Per te, diacholon . . .*, which yields no reasonable sense). Here belongs also Dioscorus II, NZ' (Rom. Forsch. X, p. 201,9) *hoc per ter facis*,³ where the Greek original has simply *τρίς*; and Receptar. Sangall. A 25 (JÖRIMANN, *Frühmittelalterliche Rezeptarien*, p. 13), where to stop bleeding from the nose we are advised: *de ipso sanguine in fronte scribis: 'pater talen toli'. Hoc per ter scribe*. In the same work A 51 (p. 17), concerning a similar magical formula, we are told: *hoc per ter dicere debes; sanat*.

A typical example of the sort of style and context in which the expression is found is the following passage from the Late Latin (or early Medieval) version of the *Physiologus* (CAHIER and MARTIN, *Mélanges*⁴ II, p. 166, ms. C), where the eagle and its mystical qualities are discussed and interpreted allegorically. After a citation of Psalm. 102, 5 *renovabitur ut aquilae iuventus tua*, the translator continues as follows: *volat (sc. aquila) in aera solis; extendit alas et descendit in fontem aquae. Baptizatur per ter et ascendit . . . et renovabitur et novus fit*. In the Greek text (in LAUCHERT⁵ p. 236) is simply *βαπτίζεται τρίς*.

In early medieval writers the expression is found even in passages that strive after literary effect: thus Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbae* II 44, p. 159,17 FOWLER (end of seventh cent.) in describing a miracle, uses the words: *levarent in aere et excuterent eandem per ter tunicam* (sc. *Sancti Columbae*); similarly Aldhelm of Malmesbury (ob. 709), *Carm. de virginitate* 821 *ille crucis pingens per ter signacula sulcat*. On a rather lower literary level is Erchempert's *Historia Langobardorum Beneventanorum* (end of ninth century); cf. here c. 31 (p. 246, 25) *per ter iuravit*; but in c. 38 (p. 249, 8) *ter occurrit*.

¹ One ms. has *ter per*, which ROSE reads.

² See LÖFSTEDT, *Verm. Stud.*, pp. 199 f.

³ This and the next example are quoted by SVENNUNG, *Untersuchungen*, p. 331.

⁴ See above p. 33, note 2.

⁵ F. LAUCHERT, *Geschichte des Physiologus*, Strassbourg 1889.

How are we to account for this strange idiom? Some attempt has been made to represent it as a contamination of *ter* and *per tres vices*; but this view hardly satisfies, since we find only *per ter*, never *per bis*, or *per quater*, or *per decies*, etc., where one might equally have expected such a contamination. It is also remarkable that the usage is confined almost entirely to formulae of oath-taking or magic.¹ The examples given above speak for themselves: the medical recipes form no exception, since the distinction between medicine and magic in late classical and early medieval times is notoriously difficult to draw.² The explanation of these two restrictions is to be sought in two well-known passages of the New Testament, each pregnant with a mystic significance. In Act. Ap. ch. 10 and 11 there is an account of Peter's vision and its consequences: "he fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as if it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth; wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat!" Peter is unwilling, and the injunction is twice repeated: "This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven." The Vulgate has, c. 10,16: *hoc autem factum est per ter, et statim receptum est vas in caelum*. Exactly the same expression is repeated in 11,10 where Peter recounts his vision: *hoc autem factum est per ter, et recepta sunt rursus omnia in caelum*. In both places the Greek text has ἐπὶ τρίς,³ which provided the model for the Latin construction.

This vision and its interpretation took so powerful a hold upon the Christian imagination, that the very form of words — associated as it was with the magic number three — found its way into medieval usage, but almost exclusively in contexts relating to magic, miracles, or spells. Thus Erchempert writes *per ter iuravit*, but with the colourless *occurrit* he uses the simple adverb *ter*. Habent sua fata locutiones Scripturae Sacrae!

¹ I have only met one exception, *Annales Regni Francorum* (Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum ex MGH separatim editi, ed. F. KURZE 1895) p. 42 (A.D. 775): *praeda multa adsumpta et per ter stragia Saxonum facta . . . Carolus rex ad propria reversus est auxiliante Domino*. It is not surprising to find an isolated passage in which a Christian writer uses the expression in a rather different context.

² On the medieval *receptaria* see JÖRIMANN pp. 140 and 157 f. He thinks that they date from the eighth and ninth centuries and were compiled by monks from older collections of receipts.

³ BLASS in his commentary compares εἰς τρίς in Herodotus and Xenophon; PREUSCHEN-BAUER, Wörterbuch 450 extr. refer to CIG 1122,9 (ἐπὶ τρίς).

CHAPTER VI.

THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK

The influence of Christianity upon Latin is, as we have seen in the last chapter, in large part reflected in Graecisms and Greek loanwords. Consequently it is difficult alike in theory and practice — indeed it is often quite impossible — to draw a clear line between the two great streams of influence in Late Latin, the one derived from Christianity and its sacred texts, the other from the language and literature of Greece. Some of the problems to be treated in the present chapter might well be referred to the Christian sphere of influence which we have already discussed, but here we shall look at them from a different point of view.

It is exceedingly difficult to give a vivid or a tolerably accurate picture of the influence of Greek upon Latin during all its diverse stages. To achieve anything like success would require the unusual combination of highly cultivated literary judgment and an intimate first-hand knowledge of the language in all its subtle nuances and its different developments down to the time of the break-up of Latin as a spoken language. But even if we restrict our enquiry to Late Latin, we find difficulties enough. Fundamentally important is for instance the extensive literature of translation, particularly in the fields of theology and church discipline, and of technical literature in general. Yet apart from the Latin translation of the Bible,¹ there has been almost no systematic study of the technique of these translators in rendering an important

¹ The literature is extensive: it is sufficient to name F. KAULEN, *Sprachliches Handbuch zur biblischen Vulgata*, 2. Aufl. (Freiburg im Breisgau 1904); W. E. PLATER and H. J. WHITE, *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford 1926); FR. STUMMER, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn 1928); W. SÜSS, *Das Problem der lateinischen Bibelsprache*, *Histor. Vierteljahrsschrift* XXVII, pp. 1 ff.; id., *Studien zur lateinischen Bibel I* (Tartu 1933). Further references are to be found in all these books.

work from Greek into Latin;¹ and we must also admit that, despite some excellent monographs and grammatical and lexicographical studies, our knowledge of Late Greek is far from complete; which is not perhaps surprising in view of the enormous mass of the material. Nevertheless, as far as the general character of Late Latin is concerned, the lines of development are fairly clear, and some of the results of enquiry may profitably be illustrated here by concrete examples.²

The influence of Greek is naturally at its strongest in those authors who are constrained by their own inadequacy or by reverence for their original to a word-for-word translation. In this connexion we may remember the words of Jerome (Ep. 57, 5): *Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor, me in interpretatione Graecorum, absque Scripturis Sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu*. Thus even a man of Jerome's abilities saw a divine mystery in the word-order of the Bible, but the principle he enunciates here does not always guide his practice.

The earliest Latin versions of the Bible, the so-called 'Itala', provide numerous examples of this slavish adherence to the original. The material has been brilliantly set out by RÖNSCH, the modest deacon of Lobenstein, an insignificant township in Thuringia, who raised a 'monumentum aere perennius' in his 'Itala und Vulgata' (2. Aufl. 1875), a work of the most striking erudition and still as indispensable as ever.³ Here one finds (pp. 434 ff. and particularly pp. 451 ff.) a collection of typical examples of translator's Graecisms; as Matth. 11, 11 (cod. Veron.): *maior eius est*, in imitation of the Greek *μεῖζων*

¹ For some interesting observations see F. BLATT, *Remarques sur l'histoire des traductions latines*, *Classica et mediaevalia* I (1938), pp. 217 ff. — Important material is available, e. g., in the *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, edited by EDUARD SCHWARTZ — a monumental edition, of which the first volume appeared in 1922. Many of the volumes have valuable indices.

² The material is given and analysed at greater length in my *Syntactica* II, pp. 406–457; *Verm. Stud.*, pp. 197 ff.; *Mélanges de Philologie* ... offertes à J. Marouzeau (Paris 1948), pp. 391 ff. For the development in general cf. J. BRENOUS, *Étude sur les hellénismes dans la syntaxe latine* (Thèse, Paris 1895) — a valuable work, although a little antiquated; HOFMANN, pp. 813 ff., where further bibliography is given.

³ See also his *Semasiologische Beiträge*, I–III (Lpz. 1887–1889). — The value of the work consists rather in its enormous amassing of material than in its notions of linguistic history, which were faltering when it was published and now are antiquated; but it is none the less a great contribution to scholarship.

αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. The Vulgate more grammatically has *maior est illo*. The one example sufficiently illustrates the type: for further examples the reader is referred to RÖNSCH.

It is particularly interesting that Augustine was well aware of this kind of feature in the translations current in his day, and discussed them in his 'Locutionum in Heptateuchum libri septem',¹ a work of the greatest interest both to the Biblical scholar and the philologist. In our day the work has been studied with valuable results as to language and textual criticism by WILHELM SÜSS in his 'Studien zur lateinischen Bibel' I. A few of the constructions remarked by Augustine may be cited as typical examples. In Locut. p. 619,18 he cites Josua 22, 11: *et audierunt filii Israhel dicentium*. He remarks: *non ait dicentibus vel dicentes*, meaning that after a verb of listening or obeying² an accusative or dative would have been normal.³ In the Vulgate Jerome recasts the sentence: *quod cum audissent filii Israhel*. In another passage Augustine objects to a similar genitive, this time after *obaudio*, Locut. p. 622,1 (on Jud. 2,20 *et non obaudierunt vocis meae*): *graeca magis locutio est*. The Greek text in fact has οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν τῆς φωνῆς μου. This genitive again is studiously avoided in the Vulgate: *et vocem meam audire contempsit*. For us however, the interesting question is, how far has the genitive after *audire* been used in Late Latin. The answer is given by Thes. L. Lat. II, p. 1262, 62 ff. (cf. also RÖNSCH, p. 438): it is confined to a few passages from the Itala, with the exception of one solitary and rather uncertain example from the Vita Vedastis (seventh century or later). In other words, the Graecism in question did not become to any extent naturalized in Latin. These examples may be taken as typical.

In other passages faithfulness to the Greek text is carried so far as to produce a senseless and mechanical 'transcription', to use RÖNSCH's own

¹ Edited by J. ZYCHA, CSEL XXVIII, sect. III : 1, pp. 507–629. By *locutiones* Augustine means (cf. p. 507,5 ff.) *Locutiones scripturarum, quae videntur secundum proprietates, quae idiomata graece vocantur, linguae hebraicae vel graecae*.

² Thus already in Apul., Apol. 83 (parallel to *auscultare* with dative). The writer of the article in the Thes. L. Lat. II, p. 1262,65 refers us to Justin II 11,7, but he can hardly have read the passage, which runs: *audito regis imperio discessere ceteri*. There are some other strange features also in his treatment of this verb.

³ The matter is in fact a little more complicated than this. Süss p. 41 remarks: "Den deklinierten Infinitiv des Grundtextes hatte der Grieche mit λυόντων wiedergegeben und damit dem Lateiner seine unlateinische Konstruktion mit dem Genetiv an die Hand gegeben."

expression,¹ rather than a genuine Graecism, however harsh. In many cases the ultimate cause is to be sought in Hebrew. Augustine (Locut., p. 508,5 ff.) quotes from his *latini codices* the following passage (Gen. 2,16): *ex omni ligno, quod est in Paradiso, escae edes*. The construction is hopelessly un-Latin, and is directly transcribed from the Greek *βρώσει φάγη*, which in its turn goes back to a curious Hebrew idiom (Süss p. 8). Naturally Augustine was unable to get to the root of the matter, and his remarks on it need not be quoted. The Vulgate renders it: *ex omni ligno paradisi comedet*. A similar phenomenon occurs in Num. 14,31 (cf. Aug. Locut. 588,1 ff.): *terram, quam vos abscessistis ab ea*, where the LXX has: *ἤν ὑμεῖς ἀπέστητε ἀπ' αὐτῆς*. Augustine rightly observes: *usitatum esset: a qua vos abscessistis. Nunc vero et quam abscessistis dictum est novo more et additum est ab ea, sicut Scripturae loqui solent*. But here again he is not able to pursue the phenomenon to its ultimate origin, which is a Hebrew idiom. The problem is discussed by Süss, pp. 59 ff.

Such barbarous imitations of Greek originals do not play a very important part in the development of Latin.² Nevertheless, they do appear elsewhere than in the Scriptures, as, e. g., in the important Latin version of Irenaeus (which, largely for this reason, I am inclined to date relatively early). Its language is peculiar and often obscure, and the difficult problems, also of their textual criticism, have been recently attacked by SVEN LUNDSTRÖM in two penetrating studies.³ He revives RÖNSCH's somewhat neglected concept of 'transcription', of which he distinguishes several types, with numerous and interesting examples of each.⁴ Thus Irenaeus V 27,1 (II 398,3 f. HARVEY) has: *... in aeternum ignem mittere, quod praeparatum est a Patre ...* = *πῦρ ... δ ...*. Thus the manuscripts: editors print *qui praeparatus est*; but the same *quod* occurs in Itala (cod. d), Matth. 25,41. The expression is indeed barbarous enough, yet LUNDSTRÖM can find one to surpass it: Itala (cod. Laud.), Act. Ap. 6,1 *factus est murmuratio* (Greek *ἐγένετο γογγυσμός*). The form of the predicate in the Latin follows, not the Greek predicate, but the gender of the Greek subject.⁵ These examples will serve our turn at present; for more the reader may consult LUNDSTRÖM.

¹ RÖNSCH (p. 451) even speaks of "Gräcismen der rohen Transcription."

² But see below pp. 100 ff.

³ Studien zur lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung, Diss. Lund 1943; Neue Studien zur lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung, ib. 1948.

⁴ Studien, p. 16 ff.

⁵ The Vulgate renders quite grammatically: *factum est murmur*.

A striking usage is that of *Verbum* (= ὁ Λόγος) with a masculine pronoun or attribute in places where the reference is to the Word incarnate in Jesus Christ. Here undoubtedly we have to reckon with a *constructio ad sensum*.¹ For example, Iren. II 2, 4 (I 256, 7 ff.) *idoneus est et sufficiens ad formationem omnium proprium eius Verbum*. LUNDSTRÖM remarks that he knows of no original Latin composition in which *Verbum* in this sense is constructed as a masculine, and certainly such examples are far to seek. But cf., for example, Rusticus, Contra acephalos (PL 67, 1191 B): *quia Verbum a consubstantialibus non natura neque substantia, sed sola persona discretus est*.

Our study of the historical development of Latin does not oblige us to concern ourselves longer with this blind and fumbling school of translation-technique, of which the Itala and the Irenaeus translation are prodigal of examples.² But it is only against this background that we can realize the importance of Jerome's great creation, the Vulgate. It was indeed a contribution to Latin letters of primary significance.

Purely in passing we may notice that an excessively mechanical technique in translation is also to be found in a very different branch of literature, namely the technical and scientific works which were translated from Greek into Latin in the late Empire. In some cases we find a peculiar and interesting kind of 'translator's Latin', the so-called 'calques linguistiques' or rather 'calquessémantiques', with which we shall deal at greater length later. For example, the turning-point in an illness is sometimes called *iudicium*, which from the point of view of Latin semantics is quite startling and unparalleled: nevertheless, it occurs in some medical writers, as NIEDERMAN³ remarks. It is in fact a pure translation of the Greek κρίσις, which the medical translators compel to serve their turn in this sense simply because it corresponds to κρίσις in most other senses. Cf. Caelius Aurelianus, Chron. pass. IV 113: *ultimo vero aegritudinis properare iudicium, quod crisis appellant*; similarly Liber glossarum p. 22, 11 f. *creticis* (i. e. *criticis*) *diebus, id est iudicialibus vel determinativis*.

¹ LUNDSTRÖM, Studien, pp. 39 ff.; HARVEY II 429, n. 4.

² The strong influence of the Itala upon Christian Latin in other respects has been rightly pointed out by CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, Latin vulgaire. Latin des chrétiens (Paris 1952), p. 30.

³ See his acute study, Les gloses médicales du Liber glossarum, in Emerita, vol. XII (Madrid 1944), p. 73. A quite different example is given by the same scholar in Mnemosyne, ser. III, vol. III, p. 275.

I pass on to the genuine Graecisms in Latin, those which played their part in the history of literature and style, and which ultimately through the medium of Vulgar Latin left their mark upon the Romance languages. The material is very extensive, and I must be content to cite some leading examples, while referring the reader to my more detailed treatment in *Syntactica* II, ch. XIV. But I shall also add something to the material there set out.

A certain difficulty arises at the outset in defining the notion of a 'Graecism'. Often the origin of a construction lies in some old and genuinely Latin linguistic tendency, which became more widely operative under the stimulus of a parallel Greek model. A typical example of this class is the so-called *accusativus respiciendi* in poetry and poetical prose, with which I shall shortly deal. In other cases we genuinely have what RIEMANN¹ calls an 'imitation voulue de la syntaxe grecque; un hellénisme, c'est la tentative que fait un écrivain d'introduire dans sa langue une construction qui était jusqu'alors inconnue à cette langue et qu'il emprunte au grec.' A similar definition is given by KROLL, who has some valuable pages on Graecisms in his 'Studien', pp. 249 ff. Thus Graecisms do not form a single closely-knit class, but consist of a series of diversified phenomena, ranging from native idioms somewhat strengthened and reinforced by a Greek parallel — in which case we might perhaps speak of partial Graecisms — to the boldest imitation of constructions characteristically Greek and having no possible basis in the history of Latin syntax.

There is another matter of prime importance which must be touched in passing. It has sometimes been the fashion to show great enthusiasm in hunting for Graecisms even in classical prose literature, enthusiasm such as animated the great Livian scholar KÜHNAST,² who sought a Greek model for a very great number of the idiosyncrasies of Livy's style and syntax.³ The reaction was not long in coming. In his brilliant 'Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live' (2. éd. 1885) — a work richly deserving the attention of every serious Latin scholar — O. RIEMANN vigorously attacked this all too ready acceptance of Graecism as a universal explanation. The scepticism which he exemplifies is healthy in itself, but in some individual cases seems to me to have been taken rather too far.⁴

¹ *Études* (mentioned below), pp. 16 f.

² L. KÜHNAST, *Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax* (2. Bearb., 1872).

³ For a more detailed consideration see *Syntactica* II, p. 407.

⁴ An example below pp. 95 f.

I have already mentioned the accusative of respect, also called *accusativus graecus*, which is well known in such passages as Virgil, Aen. I 320 *nuda genu*; Prop. II 5,28 *Cynthia verba levis*, and so forth. Its development in Latin is characteristic of the partial or literary Graecism, and thus deserves our attention for a little while.¹ The native element in this construction is very limited indeed; in fact it is almost entirely lacking in Early Latin. On the other hand the accusative following passives of verbs meaning 'put on', 'dress', etc. is a genuine Italic growth and is attested in Umbrian (see PLANTA II 410): thus *pallam induor*, *pallam indutus*,² etc. Here beyond any doubt we have to do with a direct object accusative after a middle voice. This construction, as HOFMANN observes, was extended to that in which the accusative refers to a part of the body, as Virg. Aen. IV 518 *exuta pedem*; see HOFMANN 379 on this construction and its general avoidance in classical prose. NORDEN has an interesting remark on Aen. VI 281 *vipereum crinem vittis innexa cruentis*: "Die dieser Konstruktion des Akkusativs ursprünglich gezogenen Grenzen sind erst von den augusteischen Dichtern weit überschritten worden, von Vergil noch weiter als von Horaz und zwar in steigendem Masse von Werk zu Werk und innerhalb der Aeneis von Buch zu Buch."

The influence of Greek makes itself especially felt when this construction is extended to ordinary adjectives, as *nuda genu*, etc. This usage is unknown in Early Latin and in normal prose, but achieves a wide popularity with the Augustan poets. The Greek origin is obvious enough: indeed in not a few places we can point to a specific original. Thus Virg. Aen. I 589 *os umerosque deo similis* is imitated from Homer, Iliad B 478 ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἰκελὸς Διὶ; sim. Aen. V 285 *Cressa genus* from Iliad Ψ 471 Αἰτωλὸς γενεήν; even Aen. VIII 114 *qui genus?* from τίνες τὸ γένος.

It is highly relevant to the history of style that this purely poetical type of construction occurs again in the poetical prose of Tacitus, as Ann. VI 9 *clari genus*, etc., and in the extravagantly graecizing Apuleius. As regards the latter, it is interesting to note that the construction does not occur with a uniform distribution throughout his works: in the Apologia, which approaches more closely to the style of classical prose, it is not found at all, as VON GEISAU points out;³ in the philosophical works it does not occur either; but it is

¹ More detail in Syntactica II, pp. 421 f.; 425 ff.

² Material in BENNETT II 222 (especially the perfect participle).

³ J. VON GEISAU, Syntaktische Gräzismen bei Apuleius, IF XXXVI, pp. 70 ff.; 242 ff.; on the accusative of respect pp. 76 ff.; 86.

limited to the *Metamorphoses* and the *Florida* (including the preface to the *De deo Socratis*). In other words it is confined to those works in which the current theories of style enjoined an admixture of poetic phraseology. In the opinion of VON GEISAU the usage becomes more frequent and more bold in the course of the *Metamorphoses*,¹ and distinguishes many of the *panni purpurei*, or 'Glanzstellen', as he calls them.

I have spent some time upon this construction, since its development and character are to a certain extent typical of a great many Graecisms. In other cases the explanation is disputed, although to my mind wrongly. I shall deal briefly with two other examples concerned with case-syntax. One is afforded by Horace's *Daunus agrestium regnavit populorum* (*Odes* III 30,11–12). HOFMANN (p. 408) invokes the analogy of *potiri* with the genitive, but I can see here only a pure Graecism, imitating the use of ἄρχειν, βασιλεύειν, etc. with a genitive.² Quintilian (IX 3,17) refers to Horace's penchant for this type of imitation, and the Late Latin use of the genitive after other verbs meaning 'rule over' is evidently of similar origin. WÖLFFLIN in ALL VII, p. 120 cites two Itala quotations in Tertullian for *dominari* with the genitive, where in both cases the Greek text has κυριεύειν with the genitive.³ Augustine's remark is also instructive (*Locut. de Genesi* III, p. 507,15) *implete terram et dominamini eius: latina enim locutio est dominamini ei*. There is an example of *praesidere* with the genitive which has not to my knowledge been noted: *Novell. Justin.* 28,5 pr.: *scientem, quantorum quidem virorum, quantarum praesidet civitatum*, which is simply based upon the Greek text εἰδόμενα πόσων μὲν ἀνδρῶν, πόσων δὲ ἡγήσεται πόλεων.⁴ Even *obtinere* is occasionally to be found with a genitive: *Lib. geneal. chron.* I, pp. 188,508 and 189,514 *obtinuerunt eorum annis* ... 'they ruled over them for — years'. Thus I think that there can be no question as to the true nature of Horace's construction *regnavit populorum*: it is a pure Graecism, and a bold one. It is perhaps

¹ See the observations of NORDEN on this accusative in the *Aeneid*, quoted on the preceding page.

² The same holds good of the Late Latin examples, *Vulg., Sap.* 3,8 *regnabit Dominus illorum* (βασιλεύσει αὐτῶν) and *I Mach.* 12,39 *regnare Asiae* (βασιλεύσαι τῆς Ἀσίας).

³ A number of examples (Itala and some late Christian writers) are given in *Thes. L. Lat.* V:1, 1902,14 ff.; 1905,1 ff. and 65 ff.

⁴ An equally obvious Graecism occurs *ibid.* 30,5 pr.: *et nullius neglegat omnium* = οὐδενὸς ἀμελήσει τῶν πάντων.

not entirely a coincidence, that Horace should use this construction precisely in a context where he is acknowledging his debt to Greek models.

For *mirari* with the genitive HOFMANN, p. 408 and KÜHNER-STEGMANN I, p. 474 give one example, Virg. Aen. XI 126: *vir Troiane, quibus caelo te laudibus aequem? iustitiaene prius mirer belline laborum?* HOFMANN, somewhat oddly, explains this use of the genitive by the analogy of *memini* and similar verbs, and refers us to Aen. XI 280 *veterum memini laetorve laborum*, while HAASE, supported by SCHÄFLER,¹ supposes the analogical influence of *felix*, *fortunatus*, *praeclarus* with the genitive. For my part, when I see the rather artificial and far-fetched nature of these explanations, I find my sympathies with BRENOUS, who observes (p. 110): "Ces rapprochements sont très légitimes, si l'on veut montrer comment en latin déjà les voies étaient préparées aux constructions hardies dont il s'agit. Mais on ne saurait raisonnablement prétendre par là les dépouiller de leur vrai caractère, qui est d'être grecques." The same may be said of the uses of this construction in Late Latin, as Jerome, Tract. in Psalm. 93 (Anecd. Mareds. III : 3, p. 83,21) *mirantur homines philosophorum ac poetarum dicentium: o curas hominum, o quantum est in rebus inane*. On this passage MORIN observes: "Graeca constructio est τινὸς ἄγαμαι."

A striking Graecism, which seems to be restricted to certain Christian fathers and translators, is the impersonal use of *capit* (usually negated) with an accusative and infinitive, corresponding to the Greek ἐνδέχεται 'it is possible': cf. Luc. 13,33 *non capit prophetam perire extra Ierusalem*; in the Greek text οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι, etc. This construction is particularly common in the bold and mannered prose of Tertullian, as in the De an. 46,2 *non capit solam eam eventui omnibus debito eximi* (for further examples see RÖNSCH, pp. 351 f.; HOPPE, Synt. u. Stil des Tert., p. 48; WASZINK (1947) on De an. 4 (p. 123); Thes. L. Lat. III 333,28 ff.). The usage is not uncommon in the translation of Irenaeus: LUNDSTRÖM gives ten or so examples in his dissertation p. 91, where he remarks that the verb is normally negated and in the present tense (there is one example of *capiet*). Compare also the Shepherd of Hermas, versio Pal., Mand. 11, 12 *non enim capit facere haec Dei prophetam* (οὐκ ἐνδέχεται with accusative and infinitive).²

¹ J. SCHÄFLER, Die sogenannten syntaktischen Graecismen bei den augusteischen Dichtern, Münchener Diss., Amberg 1884, p. 39.

² More doubtfully Epiphaniï Interpr. evangel. p. 146,1.4 ERIKSON (Lund 1939) where *porta* may conceivably be the subject.

The construction, as it appears in these examples, is an unmistakable Graecism. Nevertheless, a so learned and ingenious scholar as SPITZER (in *Vox Rom.* I, 1937, p. 208) has combined it with Spanish *no cabe* (from *non capit*) with infinitive or substantive, as in *no cabe saber* 'there is no knowing', or *no cabe duda*¹ 'there is no doubt'; he takes as his starting point a use of *non capit* meaning — as Sp. *caber* 'have room for' — originally, he says, 'es fasst nicht', and the development of the impersonal *capit*, he thinks, was merely parallel to that of *ἐνδέχεται* in Greek.

In face of the evidence which I have given above, this view does not seem to me tenable, and the whole attempt to link it to this particular construction of *capit* with accusative and infinitive (as in the examples given above) is not quite convincing. The comparison with the Spanish examples² is, however, a valuable contribution. In them (*no*) *cabe* is followed by an infinitive clause or a substantive, which seems to me a lineal descendant of Latin (*non*) *capere* with substantive or infinitive in the meaning of *capacem esse*, *capere posse* 'be capable of', 'admit', 'allow' (properly 'hold', 'take in'), a common classical usage. From the abundant material given by the *Thes. L. Lat.* III 332 f. we may quote as typical: Quint. Inst. or. V 7,1 *si reprehensionem non capit ipsa persona* (sc. rei); Ps.-Quint. Decl. 17,10 *fidem non capit, ut me tres absolutiones et innocentem probaverint et effecerint parricidam*; Paul. Digest. 45,1,73 pr. *interdum ... stipulatio ex re ipsa dilationem capit*; Tert. De an. 21,7 *quod natum factumque constiterit, eius natura capiet demutationem*; Adv. Hermog. 7 *praescribo non capere ullam diminutionem et humiliationem quod sit aeternum*; De pudic. 19 (p. 265,23) *graviora et exitiosa, quae veniam non capiant*; Cl. Claud. 24,133 *cuius (i. e. Romae) ... nec laudem vox ulla capit*. Similarly *capere* with an infinitive, almost equivalent to *posse*: Tert. De bapt. 15 (p. 214,5) *nec capit numerari, quod non habetur*; Vulg., IV Esdr. 4,27 *non capit portare quae ... iustis repromissa sunt*.

I need hardly point out the very striking similarity between this construction, so widely used in Late Latin,³ and the examples quoted from Spanish

¹ *duda* subst. = 'doubt'.

² On similar constructions in Rumanian with the compound *încapă*, *încapăa* see M. L. WAGNER in the quarterly 'Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen' VI, p. 3.

³ The frequency of this construction may account for the occasional use of *capit* with acc. and inf. in a bold imitation of the Greek *ἐνδέχεται*, which obviously is closely related. Thus this Graecism also is in the line of previously existing Latin expressions.

by SPITZER. The Spanish dictionary of SLABÝ–GROSSMANN gives the phrase *no cabe perdón* 'it is unforgivable', literally 'it is incapable of pardon', which exactly reflects Tertullian's (De pud. 19) *quae veniam non capiant*. The connexion, both etymological and semantic, between the two is undeniable. Finally we may compare Spanish *si cabe* 'if it is possible' with Latin *si capit* in the same sense (almost = *si fieri potest*): Tert. De an. 28,4 *respice ad hypogeum eius* (sc. *Pythagorae*) *et, si capit, crede*.

If we turn our attention to particles, we find a striking Graecism in Late Latin in the use of *non solum . . . sed etiam* and its variants. Thus in the Latin version (c. 400) of the Acta Archelai, c. 60 (p. 87,27 BEESON), we read: *alioquin haec secundum te ad somnium nobis redeunt universa et figuras; non solum autem, sed et adventus nomen delebitur; poterat enim in caelo positus facere quae voluerat* (sc. *Iesus*), *si spiritum eum esse, non hominem, dicis*. This suppression of the first clause, which is left to be supplied from the preceding contents, is to the best of my knowledge unattested in any earlier author. It is to be found, however, in the Visio Pauli 18 (p. 135,24 SILVERSTEIN) *cum alia fornicatus sum. Non solum autem, et nocui eam valde, sustuli enim et facultates*. In both places the meaning is the same: 'not only that, but even . . .', 'as if that were not enough, but . . .' Further examples are given in Mélanges . . . offertes à J. Marouzeau (Paris 1948), p. 393; to them we may add Irenaeus Lat., Mass. I 25,2 (I p. 206 HARVEY) *non solum autem, sed et his omnibus, quae in eo sunt facta*. The Greek text as quoted by Hippolytus has οὐ μὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ποιημάτων. The original model for all these late examples is palpably to be felt in the Vulgate, e. g., Ep. ad Rom. 5,2 f. *gloriamur in spe gloriae filiorum Dei. Non solum autem, sed et gloriamur in tribulationibus*. Here the Greek text has οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πανχόμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν. Similarly ibid. 5,11; II Cor. 8,18 f. *Misimus etiam cum illo fratrem, cuius laus est in evangelio per omnes ecclesias; non solum autem, sed et ordinatus est ab ecclesiis comes peregrinationis nostrae* = οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτονηθεῖς.¹

It is clear from these examples that this brachylogy occurs only in translations from the Greek² or in writers under strong Greek influence, particularly the influence of Biblical Greek. In Late Greek, on the other hand, it is widely

¹ Rather differently Ep. ad Rom. 8,23 and 9,10: *non solum autem illa, sed et . . .* In both passages the Greek has the shorter οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ . . .

² Both the Acta Archelai and the Visio Pauli are translated from Greek, but the originals have perished.

spread; cf. BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Neutest. Gramm.* § 479,1, and the fresh examples collected by WIFSTRAND in *Eikota* I, p. 6; II p. 26.¹ Among the latter are examples from Dio Chrysostom, Clement of Alexandria, Lucian, etc., and papyrus sources. Cf. for example Dio Chrysostom XLIII 10 (Socrates) καὶ τοὺς νέους ἐκώλυε διαφθείρεσθαι, οὐ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους. Likewise in a papyrus of the second century of our era, Berl. griech. Urkunden I 22: περιέσχισέ μοι τὸν κιτῶνα καὶ τὸ πάλλιον, οὐ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπηνέγκατό μου . . . ἃς εἶχον κιμένας. For further examples see WIFSTRAND *op. cit.*

When we now in retrospect consider the sample of Graecisms which we have discussed, and which may be taken as fairly representative, it is impossible not to conclude that, interesting and noteworthy as they may be, they nevertheless exercised no decisive or lasting influence upon the structure of Latin as a whole. For the most part the Latin language stood for centuries four-square and immovable against all that Greek influence could do.

But this is not to say that the two languages in their later stages did not at certain points approach each other and exercise a mutual influence at their points of contact. An interesting class of examples in this connexion is that of 'calques linguistiques' or 'calques sémantiques', as they have been called, in German 'Bedeutungslehnwörter'. In English they are still nameless: perhaps 'semantic loan words' or 'translation loan words' may serve our turn. The term denotes those words in a language which, having certain meanings in common with a word in another language, have developed through the latter's influence some meaning or meanings which they did not originally possess, but which were proper to their counterpart.² Thus in Latin *casus* meant 'a fall' and corresponded in this meaning to the Greek *πτῶσις*. But *πτῶσις* was also used to signify a grammatical case, and *casus* was made artificially to serve the same function. Likewise *adiectivum* was coined to correspond to the Greek *ἐπίθετον*, and became its 'calque sémantique'.

¹ A. WIFSTRAND, *Eikota*. Emendationen und Interpretationen zu griechischen Prosaikern der Kaiserzeit (K. hum. vetenskapssamf. i Lund årsberättelse, 1930–31; 1932–33).

² Cf. especially A. DEBRUNNER, *Griechische Bedeutungslehnwörter im Latein* (in *Festschrift F. C. Andreas*, Leipzig 1916, pp. 16 ff.; the examples are interesting, but do not all belong to this class); BLATT, *Acta Andreae*, pp. 42 f.; BONNET pp. 263 f. has some valuable observations; KROLL, *Studien*, pp. 252 f.; TEEUWEN, *Bedeutungswandel*, pp. 36 f.; 47; 129. On the phenomenon in general see also SANDFELD's brilliant *Linguistique balkanique*, Paris 1930, pp. 33 ff.

This phenomenon is particularly common in scientific terminology, in the technical terms of philosophy, medicine, grammar, etc. A striking example is the use of *iudicium* corresponding to the Greek *κοίσις*, which we have noticed above (p. 92). Another is *pinnae* in the sense of *πτερυγώματα* (part of the pudenda muliebria), on which see ROSE in the Latin version of Soranus' Gynaecia p. 163. In a similar connexion we find *necessarius* in some passages of the Mulomedicina Chironis, as c. 179 (p. 55,20) *collectiones nascuntur locis necessariis*; 364 (p. 111,12) *in locis necessariis nascuntur tubercula plena sanie*. In the corresponding passages of the Mulomedicina of Vegetius (I 7) the same parts are referred to as *verendae partes*. The meaning is perfectly clear,¹ but the derivation was first demonstrated by CARLSSON in Eranos XXV, pp. 189 f., who showed that *necessarius* is based upon the Greek *ἀναγκαῖα*, which is used to signify *αἰδοῖα* 'pudenda'. The same use of *necessarius* occurs already in Gaius, Inst. III 193, where he explains *licium* as *consutigenus, quo necessariae partes tegerentur*. Thus also several passages in Firmicus Maternus Math., as CARLSSON demonstrates.²

Another example, this time opening up a wider perspective, has been noted by SANDFELD (Ling. balk., pp. 33 f.), who writes: "Si le palais de la bouche s'appelle en albanais *qeze*, en bulgare *nebce*, 'petit ciel', nous avons sans doute affaire à une traduction de gr. *οὐρανός* qui se trouve déjà dans Denys de Thrace (MEYER-LÜBKE, Portius, p. 9), mais les expressions similaires roum. *cerul gurei*, 'le ciel de la bouche', ... ital. *il cielo della bocca*, esp. *el ciel de la boca*³ doivent reposer pareillement sur grec *οὐρανός*, et il semble même impossible d'en séparer holl. *verhemelte* (cf. les remarques de HESSELING, dans Neophilologus VIII, p. 62)." The explanation is clear and convincing. In fact *οὐρανός* in the sense 'roof of the mouth', 'palate' is to be found as early as Aristotle (Hist. animal.), and such medical writers as Galen and Soranus use *οὐρανός* in the same sense. As for *caelum* in Latin, that could all the more easily take over this new meaning since it had already been pressed into service in architectural parlance to mean 'vault' or 'underside of the roof'. Thus

¹ ODER p. 397 *genitalis*; GREVANDER's rendering 'empfindlich' is based on a misunderstanding.

² Similarly in the Latin Physiologus, CAHIER et MARTIN, Mélanges d'archéologie etc. (see above, p. 33, note 2) II, p. 135: *si ebiberit semen eius femina (sc. vipera), praecidit veneria necessaria masculi*. In a number of the mss. the word *veneria* is omitted: it is in all probability a mere gloss on *necessaria*.

³ Similar expressions are found in other Romance languages, e. g., modern Provençal *ceu de la buko*; see MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 1466.

Thes. L. Lat. III 94,80 ff. cites Vitruvius VII 3,3 *imum caelum* (sc. *camerarium*); CIL VI 776 *caelum cum columnis et velis*. Particular interest attaches to *caelum capitis* 'la voûte crânienne', 'the crown of the head' as in Pliny, Nat. Hist. XI 135 *hoc est viscerum excelsissimum (tectum)que caelo capitis*.¹ It is most likely that this use of *caelum*, which underlies the various expressions for 'palate' we have seen above, spread first from the scientific and technical language into everyday speech, and thus found its place in the Romance languages. The development is interesting and deserves attention, also from a more general point of view.

The situation seems to be very similar with late Greek ἀπ' ὀμμάτων,² Late Latin *ab oculis*, Old Ital. *avocolo*, Fr. *aveugle*; on which see my detailed study in Syntactica II pp. 376 f.; 439. It seems to me probable that *ab oculis* was at first a technical term of medicine, and later spread to wider circles.³ LERCH,⁴ on the other hand, thinks it more likely to have originated in religious language, where he thinks it would be more at home than in the precise language of medicine.⁵ This aspect of the question must at present be allowed to remain open, but at least it is certain that the starting point for the Romance development is *ab oculis*,⁶ which in turn is modelled upon ἀπ' ὀμμάτων.⁷

¹ I follow the text and translation of ERNOUT-PÉPIUS; earlier editors read *(proximum)que*.

² On this expression cf. S. LINNÉR, Syntakt u. stilist. Studien zur Historia Lausiaca des Palladios (Diss. Uppsala 1943), pp. 38 f.

³ See also MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 33; VON WARTBURG, FEW I, pp. 6 f. ("wohl durch die Aerzte").

⁴ Rom. Forsch. LX (1947), p. 68 ff.

⁵ He remarks, i. a.: "Als ob die Mediziner nicht zwischen 'Blindheit' und 'Augenlosigkeit' unterscheiden könnten!" But against his hypothesis we may reckon the fact that *ab oculis* does not occur in the Latin Bible, the normal expression being *caecus*, *absque oculis* occurs once: Is. 59,10, *absque* being in general very common in the Vulgate.

⁶ A further example of this expression is adduced by SVENBERG, De latina lunaria (Diss. Gothenburg 1936), p. 36 extr.: *ab oculis erit*.

⁷ The explanation newly put forward by K. HEISIG (Rom. Forsch. LXII, 1950, pp. 69 ff.) seems to me absurd. The earliest Latin examples (in the Actus Petri) are misinterpreted, and his postulate that the starting point was *ab oculo* 'with one (!) eye' has only entertainment value. — G. ROHLFS discusses the local distribution of expressions for 'blind' in the Romance languages in Arch. f. d. Stud. der neueren Sprachen CXV (1953), pp. 70 ff. He postulates an original *orbus ab oculis*, which would have given rise by a kind of fission to *orbus* on the one hand and *ab oculis* on the other. The suggestion is plausible enough in itself, but, in the absence of any attestation for *orbus ab oculis* in Late Latin, it cannot be confirmed.

In the field of philosophy a striking 'calque linguistique' is the rather rare use of *conquirere* in the sense 'dispute', 'discuss (with)' — a usage which cannot but surprise the latinist. We find it first in a passage of Cicero, *De rep.* I 17 *etiam sub ipsis Numantiae moenibus solebat mecum interdum eiusmodi aliquid conquirere*. This use of *conquiro* is modelled on that of Greek *συζητεῖν*,¹ as will appear from the following examples, which are confined to Late Latin, particularly the language of the Bible, which is so greatly influenced by Greek syntax (BONNET p. 264): cf. *Itala* (cod. g), *Act. Ap.* 6,9 *conquirentes cum Stephano* (*συζητοῦντες*, *Vulg. disputantes*); *Vulg.* *Marc.* 8,11 *et exierunt Pharisei et coeperunt conquirere cum eo* (*συζητεῖν*); *ibid.* 12,28 *accessit unus de scribis, qui audierat illos conquirentes* (*συζητούντων*). Afterwards there are a few isolated examples in late Christian writers, as *Greg. Tur. De mirac. Andreae* 17 *philosophi veniebant et conquirebant cum eo*. Further examples are given in *Thes. L. Lat.* IV 356,66 ff.

In Christian Latin in general, idioms of this sort play an appreciable part. An interesting example is the use of *idoneus* and *utilis* in Late Latin. These words originally corresponded to *χρηστός* in its sense of 'useful', 'serviceable', but later takes over the secondary meanings also, as 'good', 'honest', 'worthy', or even 'brave'. Thus in the *Rule of St. Benedict* 7 all the good mss. read: *dicat semper utilis frater in corde suo: Tunc ero immaculatus coram eo, si observavero me ab iniquitate mea*. Many of the old editors, with some of the more recent manuscripts, read *humilis*, which is obviously a conjectural improvement upon the reading *utilis*, which was not understood; the meaning, as LINDERBAUER remarks in his commentary (p. 215), is "der gute Bruder"; cf. also *CIL VI* 30248 (BÜCHELER, *CE* 630) *totius utilitatis*, corresponding roughly to *πάσης χρηστότητος*; likewise in a few Christian inscriptions cited by HERAEUS,² to which we may add *CIL XII* 2096 (DIEHL, *Inscr.* 4730): *blanda, utiles* (i.e. *utilis*), *cauta* (of a nine year old girl who has died). Here we may also notice *Anon. Vales.* 12,61 *utilis Gothus imitatur Romanum*, where many editors alter the text to *uilis* or *futilis*, and the meaning is incorrectly given by SOUTER (*Glossary* s. v.) as 'rich'. BONNET 288 gives examples from *Greg. Tur.* The same sense is given to *idoneus* in *Ps.-Augustine, Serm.* 276,1 (*PL* 39,2264) *si quis ergo idoneus est, si aliquos parentes habuerit pauperes, ipsis prius*

¹ The verb is attested from Plato onwards. Cicero's familiarity with the word and conception *συζητήσις* is clearest shown in *Ep. ad Fam.* XVI 21,4 *non est enim seiunctus iocus a philologia et cotidiana συζητήσει*.

² Gött. Gel. Anz. 1915, p. 479.

necessaria tribuat; Dicta abbatis Priminii 27 (CASPARI, Kirchenhist. Anecd. 184) *qui fuit latro, sit idoneus; qui fuit somnolentus, sit vigilis*,¹ meaning 'innocens', e. g., Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. V 32 *novi, inquit pater, ego filiam meam bene idoneam, nec est verum verbum hoc, quod mali homines proloquuntur*; IX 16 *de hoc crimine ... idoneus reddi potest*.

In Medieval Latin this wider use of *utilis* and *idoneus* is carried on, as can be shown by a few examples from different sources. Fredegarius IV 25 (p. 131,1) *ubi congressus erit certaminis, ibique tua et mea utilitas adparebit*; Richer, Hist. I 10 (MGH, Script. III, p. 572,6) *utiliter ergo patrata victoria, rex tyrannum captum secum ... ducit*; Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium 14 (MGH, Script. VIII, p. 530,22) *is Erluinus omnium bonorum amicitia dignus, utpote in ea acquirenda utiliter idoneus, et in conservanda fideliter industrius*; Vitae sanctorum Danorum p. 64,8 *utiliter et innocenter fratribus cessit*; p. 65,16 *christianorum religionem utilius et honestius quam hactenus ... servaret* (about A.D. 1095);² for *idoneus* in the meaning 'innocens' see also MGH, Mer. III, p. 678. Further material for both words is given in DU CANGE. Here there is an unbroken line of development from Late to Medieval Latin.

I pass on to another example. What is the meaning of Iren. III 9,3 *advocabat autem omnes homines plangentes*? Similar expressions occur several times in Tertullian, as, e. g., Adv. Marc. IV 14 (p. 462,9 KROYMANN) *misit me curare obtritos corde ... advocare languentes*. For the explanation we must turn to the passage of Scripture which Tertullian here cites, Is. 61,2, where the Greek text has *παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας*, and the Vulgate *ut consolaretur*. The original therefore is *παρακαλεῖν*, to which *advocare* corresponded in the fundamental notion of calling someone to oneself, while subsequently it acquired in Church Latin the subsidiary meaning also of 'comfort', 'console', *consolari, recreare, iuvare* (Thes. L. Lat. I 894,37 ff.). It is not unusual to find in the early Fathers and in the Itala *advocatio* in the sense of *recreatio, consolatio*, etc., as Ps.-Cypr. De spect. 4 *ad advocacyem populi adquisiti sunt ludi scenici*; further exx. in Thes. L. Lat. I 890,72 ff. Similarly we find *advocator* meaning 'comforter', 'helper', although this use is very rare. The Thes. L. Lat. knows only two examples, of which the first is Tert. Adv. Marc. IV 15 (p. 465,13) *mendicorum advocatorem*.

¹ The example is already adduced by RÖNSCH, S. B. II 18.

² Not perfectly explained by GERTZ p. 527.

It is remarkable that this word, so sporadically attested in Late Latin, should be so widely represented in the Romance languages.¹ It must be assumed that it spread from Christian Latin into the language of everyday life, and thus became perpetuated. Under *advocator* 'Advokat' MEYER-LÜBKE REW 225 refers to Old Venetian *avoga(d)ro*, Old Italian *avvocato*, O. Fr. *avoer*, and other forms, and under the more usual form *advocatus* he remarks: "Ablt.: it. *avvocare* 'vor Gericht vertreten', sp. *abogar*, pg. *avogar* 'Sachwalter sein'. (Die Bedeutung schliesst direkten Zusammenhang des Verbums mit *advocare* 'herbeirufen' aus)." This last remark is undoubtedly correct, but the meaning of the various verbs could to my mind be easily explained on the basis of Late Latin *advocare* meaning 'comfort', 'help'. Naturally other circumstances also must be taken into account.² The Late Latin material also helps us to understand the remarkable double formation *advocatus/advocator*, both meaning 'advocate'. This peculiarity of late Christian Latin, modelled upon a Greek original, was apparently more deeply rooted than has hitherto been allowed: at all events it is, in my opinion, an indispensable element in the explanation of the Romance forms, both in their formation and in their meaning.

A more isolated usage is that of *communicare* (DEBRUNNER l. c. (cf. p. 99, n. 2) 19 with reference to RÖNSCH, p. 354; Thes. L. Lat. III 1957). The word is the natural counterpart of Greek *κοινοῦν*, and just as *κοινός* in the later language (especially in religious texts) came to mean not simply 'common' but 'vulgar', 'profane', 'impure', so does *communicare* (= *κοινοῦν*) come to mean 'to profane', 'to pollute', 'to render impure' in certain passages of the Latin Bible and the Fathers. Not only the Itala, but also the Vulgate offers examples, as Marc. 7,15 *nihil est extra hominem introiens in eum, quod possit eum coinquinare, sed quae de homine procedunt, illa sunt, quae communicant hominem*,³ Matth. on the other hand (15,11) has *hoc coinquinat hominem*. In the Contra Faustum 16,31 Augustine explains the expression: *communicat, id est, commune, profanum, ἀνάθρακτον facit*. That the word was not in general use in this sense, appears from Jerome, In Matth. 15,11 *verbum communicat proprie scripturarum est et publico sermone non teritur*.

¹ MEYER-LÜBKE in Thes. L. Lat. I 891,12 and in REW 225; VON WARTBURG, FEW I, p. 42.

² Latin *-tor*, It. *-tore*, etc. as a productive suffix for nomina agentis; with the verb *avvocare*, etc. there might even be a possible fluctuation between transitive and intransitive (or passive?) meaning.

³ So also *ibid.* 7,18 and 7,20.

In other cases it would be more proper to speak of a pure translation. An example is offered by *longanimis* and *longanimitas*, which occur (as DEBRUNNER has observed) only in Christian texts, where they are direct translations of the Greek *μακρόθυμος, μακροθυμία*. The Latin words, which play an important part in both Itala and Vulgate, served in their turn as models for the German translations *Langmut, langmütig, Langmütigkeit* (see GRIMM's Wörterbuch s. v. *Langmuth*).¹

These examples of 'calques linguistiques' or direct translations suffice. They typify a development which occurs in the languages of all cultivated societies. On their representation in German I shall be content to quote some words of KRETSCHMER, *Sprache*,² p. 45: "Das Deutsche hat seinerseits Wörter nach lateinischen Vorbildern umgedeutet, Fälle, die also nicht als spontane Uebereinstimmungen des Bedeutungswandels verwertet werden dürfen: Ausdruck nach *expressio*, Schiff der Kirche nach *navis*,³ vergeben = verzeihen nach *perdonare*, Flügel eines Heeres, Gebäudes nach *ala*, wiederholen nach *repetere* usw." Naturally examples are very numerous, and come to mind readily in all languages.

When we discuss the relations between the two classical languages, we must not forget that in the late period Latin exerted also a considerable influence upon Greek, an influence greater perhaps than is readily admitted. Thus it is that we find in Greek not merely a number of 'calques linguistiques' and direct translations from Latin, but also a large number of Latin loanwords, the latter becoming especially frequent in the Byzantine period, and surviving in many cases in modern Greek. On the 'calques linguistiques' a valuable work is that of D. MAGIE, *De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis sollemnibus in Graecum sermonem conversis* (Diss. Halle 1904); see his treatment of *στρατηγός* = *praetor* (p. 2); *Σεβαστός* = *Augustus* (p. 31), etc. The Latinisms and Latin loanwords are discussed (in some cases exhaustively) in several works, of which I can only name some of the more recent, as BLASS-DEBRUNNER, pp. 5 ff. (and Anhang pp. 3 f.); RADERMACHER, pp. 15 ff.; 27 f.; H. ZILLIACUS, *Zum Kampf der Weltsprachen im oströmischen Reich* (Diss. Helsingfors 1935) and *Das lateinische Lehnwort in der griechischen*

¹ Similarly — after Latin and German — Swedish *långmodig, långmodighet* in religious language.

² GERCKE-NORDEN, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, I (3. Aufl.) 6, p. 45.

³ Cf. Eng. *nave*.

Hagiographie (Byzant. Zeitschr. XXXVII, 1937, pp. 302–344), both containing much valuable material; for other monographs see below.¹ A good and readable introduction to the later history of Greek is DAWKINS' chapter, The Greek language in the Byzantine Period, in BAYNES and MOSS, Byzantium (Oxford 1948), pp. 252 ff.; see also his great work, Modern Greek in Asia Minor (Cambridge 1916), p. 195.

Latinisms in syntax and phraseology are rather rare. BLASS–DEBRUNNER p. 7 has among others συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν = *consilium capere* (five times in the Gospel of St. Matthew); on δὲς ἐργασίαν in Luke see also Syntactica II, p. 437 (undoubtedly a Latinism in origin, based on *operam dare*). Such an expression as τίποτε αὐτῷ βούλεται = *quid sibi vult* (in a treatise on rhetoric falsely ascribed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus p. 314, 19 USENER) RADERMACHER is probably right in seeing as a Latinism, which he believes to be unique (op. cit. p. 15). The construction σὺ ὄψῃ = *tu videris*, ὄψονται αὐτοί = *ipsi viderint* 'that's up to you (them)' noted by KORAËS and HESSELING as being of the same type, occurs in N. T., Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius; cf. DEBRUNNER l.c. 21. The influence of Latin has also left some interesting traces in the Shepherd of Hermas, as was long since remarked by ZAHN; to his work we may now add that of CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, Vig. Christ. III, p. 75. In it we find not only loanwords, such as συμψέλιον = *subsellium* and κερβικάριον = *cervical* (both very rare), but also such 'calques linguistiques (sémantiques)' as, e. g., εἰάν σοι φανῇ = *si tibi videtur, si tibi placuerit*. More examples will be found l. c.

A particular interest attaches to the question of the original form of St. Mark's Gospel. The old theory of the priority of the Latin text, supported

¹ Cf. esp. L. LAFOSCADE, Influence du latin sur le grec, in PSICHARI'S Études de philologie néo-grecque (Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études, Fasc. 92), pp. 83 ff. (a good general account, but sparsely documented); PSICHARI–TRIANAPHYLIDIS, Lexique des mots latins dans Théophile et les Nouvelles de Justinien, *ibid.*, pp. 159 ff.; GUSTAV MEYER, Neugriechische Studien III (Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Cl. der K. Akademie der Wiss. in Wien 132, III. Abhandl.: valuable and extensive collection of material); WESSELY, Die lat. Elemente in der Gräzität der ägyptischen Papyrusurkunden, Wiener Studien XXIV pp. 99 ff.; XXV, pp. 40 ff.; L. HAHN, Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten, Leipzig 1906; *id.*, Zum Sprachenkampf im röm. Reich bis auf die Zeit Justinians, Philologus, Suppl.-Band. X, pp. 675 ff. (a short, but good and readable survey); B. MEINERSMANN, Die lat. Wörter und Namen in den griech. Papyri, Leipzig 1927. DEBRUNNER reviews some recent contributions to the subject in BURSIA's Jahresber. CCXL, pp. 18 ff.

by COUCHOUD, has been attacked on various grounds by PERNOD and others.¹ No compelling linguistic or grammatical arguments for the priority of the Latin have been produced. For my part I believe that a thorough analysis from a linguistic viewpoint would establish the priority of the Greek version. I shall content myself with one argument which seems to me unanswerable. Marc. 12,42 has καὶ ἐλθοῦσα μία χίρα πτωχὴ ἔβαλεν λεπτὰ δύο, ὃ ἐστὶν κοδράντης.² In this passage codex k which COUCHOUD takes to be the most important representative of the original text, reads with the Vulgate *misit duo minuta, quod est quadrans*. Now I do not know of any Roman coin called a *minutum*, while λεπτόν on the other hand is attested in inscriptions and papyri (see BAUER s. v. and PREISIGKE III 349).³ The priority then must be assigned to λεπτά, and *minuta* is a typical 'calque linguistique'. The same may be said of Luc. 12,59 *donec . . . novissimum minutum reddas* modelled on τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτόν. COUCHOUD's argumentation (l. c. XCV, 299) is to me incomprehensible, and even PERNOD (ibid. 58) has missed the real point. Another interesting passage is Luc. 21,2 βάλλουσιν ἐκεῖ λεπτὰ δύο in the Vulgate *mittentem aera minuta duo*. Why should the translator have added *aera*? The only convincing reply is that *minuta* by itself was not genuine or idiomatic Latin. — Finally we may mention Marc. 3,6 *consilium faciebant* and 15,1 *consilium facientes*, which according to COUCHOUD (l. c. XCIV, 182) were the originals on which the corresponding Greek συμβούλιον ἐποιοῦν (ἐποίησαν) and συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες (in themselves only variants) were modelled. This, says COUCHOUD, is a 'latinisme criant,' but he is wrong. To overthrow his argument it is enough to state that *consilium facere* is not a true or inherited Latin expression at all (the normal Latin, from Plautus onward, being *consilium capere*), as we may see from Thes. L. Lat. IV 447,70 ff., which cites it only in a few passages from the Latin Bible, that is to say, in translation from Greek. Consequently these two passages can authorize no conclusion either for or against COUCHOUD's hypothesis.

¹ See COUCHOUD in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* XCIV (1926), pp. 161 ff. and XCV (1927), pp. 287 ff.; PERNOD, *ibid.* XCV, pp. 43 ff.; BURKITT, *Journal of Theological Studies* XXIX (1928), pp. 375 ff.; J. DE ZWAAN, *Mnemosyne*, N. S., LVI (1928), pp. 243 ff.

² On Latin words for measures, coinage, etc. in late Greek see below; κοδράντης is found also in Matth. 5,26.

³ E. SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3. Aufl.) II 55, remarks on λεπτόν: "Augenscheinlich stammt die Rechnung nach letzterem aus vorrömischer Zeit, ist aber auch nach Einführung der römischen Währung noch üblich geblieben."

It is the Latin loanword which appears with peculiar frequency in later Greek, many of the examples appearing relatively early. In one and the same document, Pap. Oxy. 1204 (A.D. 299), we find first l. 12 *πρὸ ἰδ καλανδῶν Σεπτεμβρίων* (*Kal. Septembr.*) *ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐν τῷ σηκρήτῳ* (*in secretario*, 'in court' as HUNT translates it, referring us to Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* VII 30 *σηκρητον δὲ ὥσπερ οἱ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχοντες ἔχων*);¹ then l. 19 *ἐκσφουνγέειν τοὺς στρατιώτας* apparently modelled on *exfundere*, cf. l. 6 *πρὸς ἐκσφούγγειν*; finally l. 26 *κομενταρίσιος* (= *commentariensis*; in Lydus several times the form *κομμενταρίσιος*, cf. *Thes. L. Lat.* III 1855,30 ff.). This is a characteristic example: it is particularly in the sphere of administration and warfare that Latin loanwords in Greek are to be found. RADERMACHER (pp. 15 f.) notes that they are current in a sharply limited set of contexts, and adds: "Es sind, wenn man absieht von selbstverständlichen Eigennamen, meistens Amtstitel und Rangbezeichnungen wie *πατρίκιος, κουβικουλάριος, καβαλλέριος* (Cavalier), Namen für speziell römische Einrichtungen im Militär- und Zivilwesen, wie *βίγλα* (*vigilia*), *κουστωδία, λεγκών, κομίατον* (*commeatus*), *κεντηνάριον* (*centenarium*), *πάκτον* (*pactum*), *παλάτιον, προαιτόριον*, Bezeichnungen für Geld, Mass und Gewicht (*δηνάριον, μόδιον, ὥρεος* = *aureus, boῦλλα bulla*), für bestimmte Stoffe und Geräte (*κράβατον*)."

Although this rule cannot be considered as hard and fast, as we shall see below, it is yet substantially correct so far as concerns the vast majority of early Latin loanwords in Greek. The elaborate and extensive lists of such words given by ZILLIACUS (*Kampf der Weltsprachen*) convey a striking impression of the extent of Latin influence, but a more continuous and thus perhaps more concrete picture of that influence can be gained from a literary work such as the *Strategicon* of Mauricius, a writer whom some have identified with the emperor of that name (582–602). At all events the composition of the work seems to date from the end of the sixth century. This work² has been printed only once, in the old and exceedingly rare edition of JOHANNES SCHEFFERUS, Uppsala 1664;³ probably the rarity has contributed to the neglect which this really important work has suffered from scholars.⁴ In it we find hybrid

¹ Further exx. in DU CANGE, *Gloss. Gr. s. v.*

² Cf. AUSSARESSES, *Revue des études anciennes* VIII (1906), pp. 23 ff.; ZILLIACUS, *Kampf der Weltsprachen*, pp. 116 ff.

³ The full title is: *Arriani tactica et Mauricii artis militaris libri duodecim.*

⁴ An honourable exception must be made of ZILLIACUS, who devotes considerable space to it in his work mentioned above. F. LOT also, in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de*

forms such as *σαγιττοβολή*, like the *σαγιττοθήκη* of Modern Greek, meaning 'quiver' (from *σαγίττα* 'arrow'). I will not attempt a systematic order in quoting passages characteristic of the writer's style. In Lib. I, c. 9 (p. 44) he has the words: *ἵνα μὴ διὰ κατασκόπων ἔκδηλος γενόμενος τοῖς ἐχθροῖς πονβλικιαυῇ* (i. e. *publicetur, innotescat*), cf. VII 11 (p. 159) *πονβλικίζειν*, thus in several other passages; II 1 (p. 48) *μηδενὸς ὄντος τοῦ δηφενδεύοντος*, cf. II 14 (p. 70) *ἐπὶ . . . φυλακῇ καὶ δηφενσίωνι*, and II 3 (p. 54) *κούρσωρας, δηφένσωρας* (*cursores, defensores*); II 18 (p. 74) *ἐπιτήδειον δὲ ἡμῖν φαίνεται τὸ τῶν καντατόρων ἔργον* (*praeconium munus*, SCHEFFERUS). A more peculiar expression is perhaps I 9 (p. 41) *τοὺς ἀντικένσωρας*, that is *antecessores* 'advance units', who go ahead to prospect for water and provisions; cf. DU CANGE, Gloss. Gr. for a more detailed account. Lib. III c. 11–16 are concerned with commands (*περὶ μανδάτων, mandata*) of various kinds, II 17 with battle-cries. Thus on p. 71 he speaks of *τὸ νοβίσκουμ* (*nobiscum*), and on p. 72 recommends that *τρίτον ἕκαστον μέρος, ἐξερχόμενον τοῦ φοσσάτου* (*fossatum*) shall shout first *τὸ Κύριε ἐλέησον*, then *τὸ νοβίσκουμ Δέους* (*nobiscum Deus*). The well known "Gott mit uns" and its equivalents thus appear to have a respectable pedigree.

The language of law and administration provides ZILLIACUS pp. 172–214 with an extensive collection of material, though by no means exhaustive, as he himself admits. A title *ἀβάκτης* (*ab actis*) is found in papyri from the fourth century onwards, *βρέβιον* (*breve*) commonly saec. III–VII, *κάπιτον* (*caput*) passim saec. VI–VII, *ἐλεκτίων* (*electio*) from saec. IV–V, *ὄφφικιάλιος* (*officialis*) saec. V–VI, *ιοῦγον* (*iugum*) several times in the Novels of Justinian, *σούος* (*suus*) ibid. XVIII 4 and in Theophilus Antecessor. Nomina agentis in *-τωρ* (after Latin *-tor*) are especially frequent: *κινάτωρ*,¹ *κουράτωρ*, *βανιάτωρ* (*balneator*), saec. VI, etc. This formation even spreads to nouns where it did not belong, as *μαγίστωρ* (*magister*), saec. V, and even *κούστωρ* (*custos*!), on which see CHANTRAINE, REL XV, pp. 89 ff.; DAIN in *Mémorial*

Felix Grat I (Paris 1946), takes the work of Mauricius as his starting point for his interesting pages on 'La langue du commandement dans les armées romaines et le cri de guerre français au moyen âge'. He speaks of the edition of SCHEFFERUS as "presque introuvable même dans les grandes bibliothèques de l'Europe." A new examination of the manuscripts and an edition of the text is a great desideratum. I have not been able to obtain confirmation of the report (ZILLIACUS, op. cit., p. 116, n. 1) that such an edition is planned by Professor DVORNIK of Prague.

¹ See also MEINERSMANN p. 25 on *κινάτωρ κάμπου, citator campi* "dem etwa 'der Aufruf auf den Exerzierplatz' oblag."

des études latines (1943), pp. 158 ff.; PALMER, A Grammar of the post-Ptolemaic Papyri I 1 (1946), pp. 8; 118 ff.

But it is not only in the fields of law, administration and war that Latin has left its strong mark upon Late Greek; its influence has persisted in other spheres, also even down to the present day, as for example in a number of common words for the material objects of everyday life, house, tools, etc. I shall content myself with citing a few typical examples, marking with an asterisk those which are still surviving. For further information I refer the reader to the collections of WESSELY and GUSTAV MEYER.¹ From this field come *σπίτι 'house' (from *hospitium*), *πόρτα (*porta*), *σκάλα (*scala*), κέλλα, *κελλάρι (from *cella* and *cellarium*),² *ἀκουμβῶ, *ἀκουμπῶ (*accumbō*), ἀκουμπίζω³ in the same sense, γούλα (*gula*, which occurs as early as the first century of our era), φάκλα (*facula*, *facla*; the latter form is proscribed in the Appendix Probi 133), *τσεκοῦρι (*securis*), *φασκιά (*fascia*), *φοῦρνος (*furnus*), πωμάριον (*pomarium*),⁴ *βαρβᾶτος or *βαρβάτος (*barbatus*),⁵ φαμελιά and *φαμίλια (*familia*), from which, with a Greek suffix, is formed *φαμελίτης (*paterfamilias*).⁶ DAWKINS (Byzantium p. 267) speaks of these and other "Latin words heard every day in Greece, though many of them have always belonged to the spoken rather than to the written language."

This mutual interpenetration of Latin and Greek extends in fact more widely and goes deeper than the special cases which we have considered. In a large number of phenomena within the fields of semasiology, idiom, and partly even syntax we can discover by patient study an internal similarity, a striking interfusion between Late Latin and Late Greek, which can only be referred to their intimate contact and fundamental community of culture. Here no less than in the matter of loanwords, both languages have given something, and both have received. Hence there are many problems in which

¹ See above, p. 106, note.

² κέλλα occurs as early as saec. II–III in the papyri (WESSELY, W. St. XXIV, 131).

³ According to MEYER "ein in sehr früher Zeit aus lat. *accumbere* herübergenommenes Wort, zugleich mit ἀκούβιον = *accubitus*, zunächst vom Liegen bei der Mahlzeit gebraucht"; see also DU CANGE, Gloss. Gr., and the lexicon of SOPHOCLES.

⁴ Found in papyri of A.D. 295 and 330 (WESSELY I. c. 145).

⁵ The meanings are interesting: 'uncircumcised'; 'stallion'; 'strong', 'brave', etc.

⁶ On this suffix see PALMER op. cit. 113 f., where hybrids such as καστελλίτης, κελλαρίτης, etc. are quoted. An even more striking formation is seen in such cases as σαβανοφακιάριον, a blend of σάβανον, *facies*, and -άριον (PALMER 84), and ὄρνιθοπούλλιον from ὄρνις and *pullus* (PALMER 86).

the question of priority cannot be settled, just as there are others in which there is no model and no imitation, but an independent parallel development on both sides. If we are not to remain content with vague generalizations and mere outlines of the subject, we must analyse each problem separately and as an entity; it is only thus that our picture of "die Periode des Zusammengehens der griechischen und lateinischen Sprache" (KRETSCHMER)¹ can become clear and concrete. But in this connexion a great deal of work remains to be done.

The literature on the subject is not extensive. Since WILHELM SCHULZE first took up the subject in his short but invaluable study 'Graeca Latina' (University of Göttingen, Program 1901), some interesting pages have been written on it by IMMISCH and by PFISTER.² Other scholars also, in various works have drawn attention to this whole complex of problems, and have sought by means of more detailed studies to settle the question whether certain parallelisms arise independently or to a certain degree by the influence of one language upon the other.³ A few typical examples of various kinds may here be cited; for more details I refer the reader to the works mentioned.

The classical use of *in primis* (*imprimis*) meaning properly 'among the first', thus 'particularly', 'especially', 'above all', is sufficiently well known, as Cic. Tusc. V 3,8 *vir doctus in primis*; Ep. ad Fam. II 8,2 *quivis nostrum, in primisque ego*. But in Late and Medieval Latin we find *in primis* (with a variant *in primo*) used in a quite different sense, namely that of *primo*, *primum*, *initio*, or the like. The Itala is much given to this use (see RÖNSCH, Sem. Beitr. II, pp. 71 f.), as in Joh. II 10 *omnis homo in primis bonum vinum ponit* (in the Greek text *πρῶτον*, Vulg. *primum*; cf. also Digest. II 15,8,8 *in primis ... dein ... tertio ...*; Commodian, Apolog. 59 *quid Deus in primis (= initio) vel qualiter singula fecit*. Examples are frequent both in vulgar and literary texts.⁴ The same situation is found in the Middle Ages,

¹ See his short but interesting survey in *Sprache*, pp. 119–121 (in GERCKE–NORDEN, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* I, 3. Aufl., 6).

² O. IMMISCH, *Sprach- und stilgeschichtliche Parallelen zwischen Griechisch und Lateinisch*, *Neue Jahrb.* XXIX (1912), pp. 27 ff.; FR. PFISTER, *Vulgärlatein und Vulgärgriechisch*, *Rh. Mus.* LXVII (1912), pp. 195 ff.

³ LÖFSTEDT, *Lateinisch-griechische Parallelen*, in *Symbolae philologicae* O. A. Danielsson ... dicatae (Uppsala 1932), pp. 171 ff.; *Syntactica* II, pp. 438 ff. (and Index p. 476); *Verm. Stud.*, pp. 197 ff.; SVENNUNG, *Oros.*, pp. 74 f.; 123 f.; *Untersuch.* 554 f. et passim (Index p. 663); SALONIUS 5 ff. (and Index p. 445); BLATT, Index p. 162.

⁴ See my *Lat.-griech. Parallelen*, pp. 175 ff.; *Syntactica* II, pp. 443 f.; some exx. in LINDERBAUER, p. 190; MØRLAND, pp. 162 f.; SVENNUNG, *Untersuch.* p. 276.

as in Adamnan's life of Columba II 11 (p. 132,29 FOWLER) *imprimis* ... *manus lavat et pedes; tum deinde cum sociis* ... *bibit*; *ibid.* p. 86,34; 146,28; 148,8; other examples in the note.¹ The expression seems to have been firmly rooted,² and the byform *in primo* (Mulom. Chir. p. 21,30; 100,30; Epiphan. p. 101,1 ERIKSON; Anthimus p. 3,17 LIECHTENHAN) still survives in Rhaeto-Romance as *emprim* (MEYER-LÜBKE III § 493).

Precisely the same meaning attaches to *ἐν πρώτοις* in Late Greek. Some examples from the Acta Apost. Apocr. are given by LJUNGVİK³ p. 95, e. g., Acta Joh. p. 155,12 f. *δίκαιον τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πρώτοις προσκυνεῖν καὶ οὕτως τὸ στόμα τοῦ βασιλέως καταφιλεῖν*; cf. also Acta Thomae p. 233,11. To these we may add a few examples from the Greek Bible, as III Reg. 17,13 *ποιήσον ἐμοὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐγκρυφίαν μικρὸν ἐν πρώτοις καὶ ἐξοίσεις μοι*, where the Vulgate has *primum*, but an Itala ms. *in primis*, cf. RÖNSCH l. c. Again we find in I Cor. 15,3 *παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον*; cf. Syntactica II, p. 445. In some passages it appears that *in primis* in this sense is directly copied from *ἐν πρώτοις*, but that there should be nothing more to the construction than an imitation of Greek usage, seems to me highly unlikely. The first beginnings are found at an early date (Suet., Aug. 16,1 has *in primis* used this way, and Sen. Quaest. Nat. V 14,1 has *in primo*) and its wide distribution, especially in more or less vulgar texts, its use in translations even where there is no corresponding *ἐν πρώτοις* in the original, its survival in Rhaeto-Romance — all these lead me to believe that it must have been a genuine and native growth in Latin, even if on occasion

¹ Examples chosen at random are Johannes Monachus, Liber de miraculis (about A.D. 1000) p. 102,28 HUBER (SMT 7) *in primis* ... *postea*; *ibid.*, append. 132,11 *in primis* ... *secundum*; GERTZ in the Index to Script. min. hist. Dan. medii aevi II 2, p. 27; SKARD, Sprache und Stil der Passio Olavi (saec. XII), p. 32; Albertanus Brixiensis, Liber consol. (saec. XIII), p. 23,7 (SUNDBY) *in primis* ... *secundo* ... *tertio*; *ibid.* p. 69,11; 76,25.

² In early Medieval Latin we find sometimes even *primis* = *in primis*: Cod. Dipl. Long. II, p. 17,9 (A.D. 758) *modo vero primis sic decerno atque instituo, ut* ...; Chron. Vulturn. (Fonti LVIII), p. 255,17 (circa A.D. 800); p. 260,13 (A.D. 803). An example from the Antidotarium Glasg. is given by SVENNUNG in Untersuch. 276. — On the analogy of *in primis* we also find *in secundis*: cf. ACO (ed. SCHWARTZ) I 2, p. 78,5 and I 3, p. 102,26 (the Greek text has *ἐκ δευτέρου*); A. ELG, In Faustum Reiensem studia (Diss. Uppsala 1937), p. 11 on *in secundis* and *in postremis*; Vulg. Proverb. 5,11 *ne* ... *gemas in novissimis* (LXX *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων*), but Didasc. Apost. 6,27 (HAULER) *in ultimis*.

³ H. LJUNGVİK, Studien zur Sprache der apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, Diss. Uppsala 1926.

a Greek model may have encouraged the usage. C. HØEG remarks that *ἐν πρώτοις* still survives in modern Greek, and is used in elevated language¹ to mean 'firstly', Fr. *d'abord*.

A similar state of affairs — parallel development, perhaps assisted by partial Graecisms — presents itself in connexion with Latin *pars* in the sense of *regio*, *tractus*, *provincia* (especially common in the plural *partes* 'districts', 'countries'), since precisely the same semantic development befell Greek *μέρος* and *μέρη*. There is nothing more common in Late Latin than such an expression as that of Victor Vitensis II 24 *episcopi in partibus Thraciae et aliis regionibus constituti*; Passio coron. 1 *ibidem in parte Pannoniae praecepit aedificare templum* (not 'in a part of Pannonia', but 'in the province of Pannonia'); Cassiod. Inst. I 5 (p. 22,22 MYNORS) *de partibus Asiae quendam ad nos venire Eusebium*.² Further examples are collected by SVENNUNG, Oros., pp. 122 ff.; see also Syntactica II, pp. 440 f.; for the corresponding usage in Greek see LJUNGVİK, op. cit., pp. 92 f. and PREUSCHEN-BAUER 795. In some cases, as for example in Biblical language, the Greek usage has influenced the Latin, cf. Matth. 2,22 *ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, Vulg. *in partes Galilaeae*. But in the main this use of *pars* and *partes* = *regio* develops naturally from such well-known constructions as Horace, Carm. I 35,22 *examen Eois timendum partibus Oceanoque rubro*; III 3,39 *qualibet exsules in parte regnanto beati*.³ To complete the picture of parallel development, both *pars* and *μέρος* in this sense survive today: cf. Span. and Port. *parte* 'place', 'region'; Mod. Gk. *μέρος* 'place', *μέρη* = 'regions', 'countries'; which make it clear that the usage belonged to the living language.⁴

In several Late Latin writers SVENNUNG (Untersuch., pp. 553 f.) has pointed

¹ Is this distinction an old one? WILHELMINE BROCKMEIER, De Sancti Eustathii episcopi Antiocheni dicendi ratione (Diss. Münster 1932), p. 35, gives some examples from Eustathius of *ἐν πρώτοις*, and adds: "quae dictio solemnior est quam τὸ πρῶτον vel πρῶτον."

² In Medieval Latin also, as for example Bede and Geoffrey of Monmouth; cf. SKARD, Målet in Historia Norwegiae (Oslo 1930), p. 23. On the Scandinavian documents see HAMMARSTRÖM, Glossarium s. v. (*in partibus* sometimes = 'in one's own country').

³ Other typical examples illustrating this development are given in my Syntactica II, p. 441.

⁴ Cf. also the English *parts* meaning 'region', 'area', 'place', often with a following genitive, as in the geographical names *Parts of Holland*, *Parts of Kesteven* (MURRAY, NED s. v. *part*, III 13). This may partly perhaps be accounted for by Latin influence, which indeed in the early examples seems to me not unlikely. Viderint peritiores.

out the use of *brevis* to mean *parvus*, as in Palladius, Op. agricult. I 24,1 *fenestellae brevissimae* (of a dovecote); I 28,1 in *insulis brevibus* ... *nutriuntur*. The first indications are found already in classical writers (Cicero, Ovid and others), cf. Thes. L. Lat. II 2181,37 and 76. In exactly the same way *βραχύς* is used in later Greek to signify 'small', cf. LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES and the lexicon of SOPHOCLES s. v., an interesting parallel, but hitherto little noticed. Svennung cites, e. g., from Orib., Syn. VII 35,3 *βραχύ τι στυπτηρίας μινύειν*; VII 50,4 *μετ' ἐλαίου βραχέος*, which the Latin translator rendered *cum oleo modico*.

If we turn to the opposite of *brevis*, it is surprising that the use of *longus* to mean *longinquus* and *longe* (*longius*) to mean *procul*,¹ in poetical diction and later on also in prose, has received so little attention; cf. Sil. It. III 422 *Geryonae peteret cum longa tricornis arva*; VI 628 *remeans olim longis Tirynthius oris*; Sen. Ep. 79,2 *Aetnam ... consumi et sensim subsidere ex hoc colligunt quidam, quod aliquando longius navigantibus solebat ostendi*. An even clearer example for *longius* is Amm. Marc. XXVII 5,6 *longius agentes Greuthungos ... adgressus est*; in the same sense probably XXXI 3,6 *Huni ... multitudinem esse longius aliquam suspicati*. A very late example occurs in Cod. Dipl. di S. Colomb. di Bobbio XIII (Fonti LII, p. 109,48; A.D. 643): *in ceteris longis regionibus* (the editor observes: "forte *longinquis*").² In Greek the use of *μακρός* in the sense of 'remote' goes back to an early period (Herod. II 32; Aesch. Prom. 814, etc.), and occurs also in the *κοινή*, as Luc. 15,13 *ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς χώραν μακράν* (Vulg. *in regionem longinquam*); ibid. 19,12. How far the more sporadic usage in Latin may be indebted to Greek influence must remain an open question, but given the same starting-point, an analogous development seems in itself a natural supposition.

¹ I have not carried out a systematic investigation, but have contented myself with culling examples as I happened to have met them. As to Propertius *longa sepulcra* in IV 1,88, the suggestion that it belongs under this head (cf. ROTHSTEIN ad loc.) does not to my mind carry conviction; see the comments of BUTLER-BARBER. Even for Propertius such an expression would be surprisingly harsh. — A rather special construction occurs in Verg. Aen. XII 52 *longe illi dea mater erit*, i. e. *nihil illi proderit*; it well illustrates the poetical and rhetorical style of Florus, that he should have taken up this construction and abbreviated it further: I 18,8 *longe illis nauticae artes*; I 22,34 *longe illi triplex murus totidemque arces*. This construction must have developed from something like Caesar B. G. I 36,5 *longe iis fraternum nomen populi Romani futurum*.

² On the authenticity of this document see CIPOLLA ibid. 105 ff.

Greater importance, especially in Late Latin, attaches to such expressions as *Itala*, Exod. 32,1 (ap. Tert. Adv. Iud. 3) *Moyses enim ille, qui nos eiecit de terra Aegypti* (ἐξήγαγεν in the Greek, *eduxit* in the Vulgate); Pass. Perpetuae 4 *quasi timens me lente eiecit caput* (sc. *draco*; the Greek version has προσήνεγκεν); Regula Magistri (PL 88,996 A) *eiecto a cellarario vino, misceantur ... singulae potiones*. It is typical that where Columella (VIII 11,15) says: *possunt in agro satis tuto educi* (sc. *pulli pavonum*), Palladius in the fourth century renders it: *et in agrum tuto eici possunt* (Op. agricult. I 28,6). This is the normal tendency of Late Latin and popular language, which replaces old and feeble expressions with something more drastic and colourful.¹ This very common use of *eicere*, *proicere*, *conicere*, etc. instead of the corresponding compounds of *agere*, *ducere*, *ferre* is dealt with in my *Syntactica* II, pp. 445 ff., where numerous examples and further references may be found.² As stated there, a close analogy is presented by the late Greek use of compounds of βάλλειν to replace those of ἄγειν or φέρειν, as ἐμβάλλειν εἰς πλοῖον = 'to embark', etc. It is not necessary to cite numerous examples: the development is parallel in the two languages, and is no less natural in the one than in the other, although the possibility of mutual influence cannot be discounted.³

The same may be said of the usage of *omnis* and *totus*, which is of such importance and interest for the student of linguistics. In the long run *omnis* was virtually replaced by *totus*, as πᾶς was by ὅλος in later Greek. On the plural *toti* see WÖLFFLIN in Rh. Mus. XXXVII, pp. 107 f. and RÖNSCH p. 338; on ὅλοι see, e. g., LINNÉR pp. 87 f.; an outline of the subject is given in my 'Vermischte Studien', pp. 209 f. The mainly original and independent character of the development in Latin is shown by the examples in classical times of such cases as *totis viribus* and *totae copiae*, "was man freilich ebensogut mit 'die ganze Macht' als mit 'alle Truppen' übersetzen kann" (WÖLFFLIN, l. c.). In the later periods this use of *toti* becomes general. From the countless examples we may cite Apul. Met. X 33 *toti nunc iudices sententias suas pretio nundinantur*; *Itala* (cod. Cant.), Joh. 13,10 *vos mundi estis, sed non toti* (πάντες in the Greek text; *omnes* in the more refined Vulgate). The result is to be seen in the Romance languages, where *omnis* survives only with a limited application in the Italian *ogni* (MEYER-LÜBKE II § 571; III § 53), while

¹ See above p. 27.

² Some good examples are also given by SVENNUNG, Untersuch., p. 537.

³ This is sometimes the case in the language of the Bible: thus Matth. 7,4 ἀφες ἐκβάλλω (Vulg.: *sine eiciam*) τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου; *Syntactica* II, p. 446.

totus rules elsewhere unchallenged: Fr. *tout*, It. *tutto*, Sp. *todo*, etc. It is clear that *totus* in Latin and similarly *ὅλος* (for *πᾶς*) in Greek ultimately won favour for the expression of the idea of totality.

We may pass briefly over some further examples of parallelism.¹ One of these is the much discussed periphrasis in which the infinitive of a verb is used together with *ἀρχομαι*, resp. *coepe*, originally in aoristic sense, later more or less pleonastically. A typical example is Vulg. Matth. 26,22 *et contristati valde coeperunt singuli dicere: numquid ego sum, Domine?* (in the Greek *ἦρξαντο λέγειν αὐτῷ*). But such a passage as this is far from proving an imitation of Greek in the construction as a whole, since much older examples come at once to hand, the earliest being in Cicero; cf. also Bell. Hisp. 39,2 *in speluncam Pompeius se occultare coepit*; Petron. 139,3 *quaerere a Gitone meo coepi, num aliquis me quaesisset*. Other examples occur in the homely narrative style of Phaedrus. On *coepe* see HOFMANN, p. 561; my Peregr. Aeth. pp. 209 f.; for a more comprehensive treatment Syntactica II, pp. 450 ff. HOFMANN has an interesting observation upon the Vitae Patrum and their Greek original: "Trotzdem das Griechische bereits im N. T. (BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 5. ed., p. 220 § 392,2) eine ganz entsprechende Funktion von *ἦρξαν(ν)το* darbot, ist es lehrreich zu sehen, dass unsere Texte in der Verwendung weit über die Vorlage hinausgehen" (IF XLIII, p. 95). To the same effect is the comment of BLATT (p. 34) on the Acta Andr. et Matth.: "die volkstümliche Umschreibung mit *coepit* findet sich im Casanatensis 18mal, von denen nur zwei gr. *ἦρξαντο* entsprechen." It thus becomes clear that this periphrasis develops independently in Latin, just as it does in Greek. Some scholars suggest a Hebrew original for the Greek idiom.

The use of *ἵχνος* to mean *πούς* in Late Greek is attested in a number of examples assembled by LINNÉR, pp. 105 f. (after PREISIGKE and LJUNGVİK²). Originally it could only be applied to the sole of the foot — indeed PREISIGKE will not allow it ever to mean anything else — but LJUNGVİK and LINNÉR allege various passages where the distinction between *ἵχνη* and *πόδες* can hardly be said to exist.³ But none of these scholars has noticed a parallel development in the

¹ On *nomen* and *ὄνομα* meaning 'person' see my Coniectanea I, pp. 42 ff.; on *proprius* and *ἰδιος* reduced to not much more than a possessive pronoun see SVENNING, Oros., pp. 65 f.

² Op. cit. 86 ff.

³ In many passages the old meaning of 'footprint' perhaps remains; cf. RADERMACHER, Byz. Zeitschr. XXVIII, pp. 399 f.

use of Latin *vestigium*, as in Catullus 64,162 *candida permulcens liquidis vestigia lymphis*, where KROLL observes: “*vestigia* ‘Füsse’, wie ἰχνοϛ Eur. Bakch. 1134”; similar change of meaning in other poets, as Sen. Thy. 1039; in late prose, e. g., Amm. Marc. XVII 13,28 *adjusi sunt vestigiis Augusti*, to which we find striking parallels in late Greek texts and papyri, cf. Acta Xanth. (LJUNGVİK 87) προσπίπτω τοῖς ἰχνεσί σου; a papyrus from A.D. 425–450 (LINNÉR 106) προσπίπτω προκυλινδούμενος τῶν θεῶν ὑμῶν... ἰχνῶν. This case of parallel development is one which deserves further attention and research.

The same may be said of the peculiar use of *tempus* and χρόνος to mean ‘a year’. Dateable examples from an early period are very few and far between. For *tempus* cf. CIL VI 1080 *felicia tempora quattor* (the inscription is dedicated to *deo imp̄ Caes. M. Aurelio ... Antonino*, probably Elagabalus, as BÜCHELER suggests, CE 274); DIEHL 2125 *vixit in pace tempora III*; GSELL, Inscr. lat. de l’Algérie I 2245 *post lacrimabile aetatis vicesimum tempus*; Sedul., Pasch. carm. I 210 *septenaque tempora lustrat* (similarly also the prose version I 18). To these and other examples already quoted¹ may be added some from a later period: Adamnan, Vita s. Columbae I 11 (p. 99,29 ff. FOWLER), speaks of a prophecy: *per tria regnabis brevia tempora*; then later (99,33): *non, ut putabat, tribus annis, sed ternis regnavit mensibus*. The expression is of interest, inasmuch as it directly attests the meaning *anni* which could be attached to *tempora*. From the Merovingian period and the Middle Ages we may cite, e. g., Vita Lupicini 8 (MGH Mer. III, p. 148,4) *transactis namque temporibus, mensibus*² ... *unum de ... fratribus ad praedam expetit hostis anticus*; Vita Petri Caelestini 32 (Anal. Boll. IX, p. 172,6) *venientibus quattuor temporibus duodecim cardinales ordinavit*; cf. SVENBERG, De latinska lunaria (Diss. Gothenburg 1936), p. 135; two examples from A.D. 1114 (communicated to me by BLATT) are given in Syntactica II, p. 492.

Exactly the same meaning is often given to χρόνος in Late Greek; cf. SOPHOCLES s.v.;³ DIETERICH, Rh. Mus. LIX, pp. 235 ff.; Syntactica II, p. 442. According to DIETERICH the oldest exx. date from about the second or third

¹ LÖFSTEDT, Lat.-griech. Parallelen, pp. 172 f.; Syntactica II, pp. 442; 492; ARMINI, Eranos XXIII, p. 163.

² On constructions of the type *horae* = *aliquot horae*, *anni* (*menses*) = *aliquot anni* (*menses*) see my Verm. Stud., pp. 73 ff.

³ Unfortunately not all his examples can be relied upon; cf. Lat.-griech. Parallelen, p. 174, n. 1.

century of our era and are from Christian inscriptions, as IG XIV 629 ζήσας χρόνους γγ'; cf. also Acta Philippi 51 (Acta Apost. Apocr. ed LIPSIVS-BONNET, II, 2, pp. 22, 21) χρόνους εἴκοσι τέσσαρας συνέζησά σοι. The construction does not need further examples in illustration: it is very widespread, so that in the Byzantine period the meaning 'year' becomes the normal one, and as such survives in Modern Greek.¹ The Greek usage must then have been more firmly rooted than the Latin, and it is reasonable to suppose that it exerted some degree of influence, if indeed it did not give birth to the Latin usage of *tempus* = year. But whether the Latin construction is simply a reflection of the Greek cannot be determined until the material has been more perfectly collected and examined.²

A different state of affairs confronts us in the use of *plus minus* with approximate expressions of number. It is to be found as early as Hirtius, De b. gall. VIII 20,1 *quae non longius . . . abesse plus minus VIII milibus dicebantur*;³ Petron. 52,1 (in vulgar dialogue) *habeo scyphos urnales plus minus C*; Martial IX 100,4 *viduas . . . plus minus . . . decem*. The formula is very common in inscriptions; cf. DIEHL III 566: "*vixit ann. plus minus sim. sescentiens ubique*" (the frequency of the phrase is attested by the common abbreviations *p. m.*, *plm.*, etc.). For details see HERAEUS, Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen, p. 32; GAGNÉR, Eranos XXIV, p. 3; further references in my Vermischte Studien, p. 206. In late Greek we find a precisely similar use of πλέον ἔλαττον, cf. CRÖNERT, Philologus LXI, pp. 179 f.; PREISIGKE s. v. ἐλάσσων; LINNÉR, p. 82. Thus in a deed of adoption of A.D.

¹ See the larger lexica and THUMB, Handbuch der neugriech. Volkssprache 353.

² Any word meaning 'time' is liable to be used to denote a certain period of time; cf. Thes. L. Lat. I 1169, 48 ff. on *aevum* = *annus* (examples few and scattered), e. g., Nemes. Cyneg. 105 *Ianus . . . pandit in occiduum bis senis mensibus a e v u m*. For *aetas* I know only one medieval example, Gesta Romanorum, p. 366, 17 (OESTERLEY) *puella ista cum ad etatem duodenam pervenisset* (or is this merely association of ideas?). The origin of the use of *tempus* and χρόνος to mean 'year' is probably to be looked for in cases where it is difficult to decide between the two meanings. DIETERICH l. c. maintains a different view, but unconvincingly. On the formula πολλοῖς χρόνοις see Lat.-griech. Parallelen, pp. 174 f. On *tempus* in ambiguous cases (either 'time' or 'year') see Syntactica II, pp. 443, n. 1; from Medieval Latin we may add the following example: Erchemperti Hist. Langobard. (MGH, Script. III) c. 44, p. 255, 11 *primo tempore . . . sequenti vero anno*.

³ FRIGELL conjectures *passuum* for *plus minus*, and is followed by MEUSEL in his annotated edition of 1920. It is surprising that so distinguished a critic should seem ignorant of the very common use of *plus minus* (see his Krit. Anhang ad loc.).

381:¹ κατέλειπεν νίον ... ὥς ἐτῶν ι πλείω ἔλαττον; S. Melaniae iun. acta Graeca (Anal. Boll. XXII; fifth century), p. 17,17 κεκτῆσθαι ... πλέον ἔλαττον χρυσοῦ μυριάδας δώδεκα. The usage is further exemplified in the works of CRÖNERT and LINNÉR.² But from the classical period there is no example, and they are rare enough in literary works of any period. Not even the inscriptions favour it greatly (one example in an inscription from Syracuse is given in Verm. Stud. l. c.); in fact it is confined, according to CRÖNERT, to Christian funerary inscriptions of the western Mediterranean area. Clearly this is no accident: everything suggests that the common and widespread Latin usage, found already at the time of Caesar, served in this case as a model for the late and very uncommon Greek construction.³

When we consider how very different were the developments which the two languages were later to undergo, on one side towards the Romance languages, on the other towards Byzantine and modern Greek, this parallelism and interpenetration may seem strange and bewildering. As far as the influence of Latin upon Greek is concerned, this reached its height (as KRETSCHMER remarks, l. c. 120) under Constantine, when he shifted the seat of empire to Byzantium, his Νέα Ῥώμη. But unlike the languages of the other conquered provinces, Greek succeeded in maintaining its position and remaining true to itself in structure and all essentials, just as Latin maintained its integrity in face of the most powerful Greek influence in the cultural sphere. But the romanizing process, which affected so many aspects of Greek life, has left one striking and symbolic memorial in the very name by which the Greek of the present day calls himself: Ῥωμιός, Ῥωμηός, i. e. Ῥωμαῖος 'Roman', and his language Ῥωμαίϊκα.

¹ MITTEIS-WILCKEN, Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde II : 2, No. 363,10.

² The latter refers us also to HASEBROEK, Das Signalement in den Papyrusurkunden, Berlin-Leipzig 1921, p. 27.

³ The frequency of this usage in Latin is further attested by the following fact, which has not, so far as I know, been noted before. In bilingual documents and in translations we often find *plus minus* without the corresponding idiom in Greek. Thus. ACO I : 3, p. 58,2 *existentes plus minus sex aut septem* (in the Greek original ὄντες μικρῶ πρός εἰς ἢ ἑπτά); p. 175,14 *triginta plus minus circa se colligens* (τριάκοντα μικρῶ πλέον); similarly ibid. I : 2, p. 33,19; I : 3, p. 58,10; p. 97,15; II : 3, p. 472,27; 473,5: generally *plus minus* (once *minus plus*) corresponds to μικρῶ πρός. — The survival in Medieval Latin of *plus minus*, contrasting with the fate of πλέον ἔλαττον, is remarked by CRÖNERT l.c.

CHAPTER VII.

SOME CHANGES IN THE NOMINAL SYSTEM

Beneath the general title of 'nomen' traditional grammar has always grouped three subdivisions — substantive, adjective, and participle. But upon closer examination it appears that these divisions are not always of primitive origin, and that in some cases they are blurred even in historical times (HOFMANN, p. 458). Thus *femina* is originally a participle in *-meno-* which has come to be used substantively: in Early Latin it is still used adjectivally, as *agnus femina*, *femina bos*, etc. Likewise *luna* is the feminine of an old adjective in *-no-*, meaning 'bright', 'shining' (cf. ERNOUT-MEILLET I, p. 664). On the other hand we often find substantives which by constant use as predicate or in apposition have come to be used as adjectives.¹ A well known example is *uber*,² originally 'udder', which by a secondary development became an adjective meaning 'fruitful'. Such examples as *victor* 'conqueror', also meaning 'victorious', *senex*, *iuvenis*, etc. serve to typify this development from substantive to adjective; WACKERNAGEL gives an acute and interesting outline of the subject in Vorles. II, pp. 53 ff., with some varied examples: Fr. *bête* 'beast', but also 'stupid'; Fr. *lilas*, Germ. *lila*, Eng. *lilac* in adjectival meaning, as *une robe lilas*, etc.

Late Latin also offers a number of examples of this persistent tendency to turn substantives into adjectives. A number of these have been dealt with by SVENNUNG, Untersuch., pp. 266 ff. (cf. *ibid.*, p. 638); the uncertainty of the manuscript tradition renders some rather dubious. On p. 268 he draws attention to Oribas. Syn. VII 33 La (p. 176 m.) *lentis quae in stagnis*

¹ On this phenomenon in general see DELBRÜCK I 418 f.; PAUL, Prinzipien, pp. 356 ff. Some interesting examples from modern French are given by H. FREI, La grammaire des fautes (Paris 1929), p. 243; cf. HOFMANN, Deutsche Lit.-ztg. 1929, 2346.

² Exhaustively treated by WACKERNAGEL II, pp. 57 f.

aquis nascuntur; similarly two passages in Oribas. Eupor.: *lenticla qui in aquis stagnis natat*; and again: *lenticla de stagnis aquis*. The observation is a valuable one, since in the Romance dialects *stagnum* is found as an adjective (MEYER-LÜBKE REW 8217 a); cf. Friaul. *age stañe* 'sluggishly flowing water', a striking parallel to *in aquis stagnis*.¹ In the case of *locus* also SVENNUNG finds various substantives used as adjectives, for instance *collis* and *campus*, cf. Oribas. Syn. IV 1 in.: *ea quae in collibus locis et non in aquosis, set in siccis nascuntur* (the Greek original has simply κατὰ λόφους ἢ ἐν χωρίοις ἀνυδροτέροις); Dioscor. III KA' (p. 385,7) *locis nascitur canphis et lapidosis* (ἐν πεδίοις καὶ τραχέσι τόποις); of earlier date, but perfectly parallel is Eustath. Bas. hex. IV 4 (905 A) *loca convallia* (see also Thes. L. Lat. IV 814,7).

In such examples as these the development can easily be understood: the substantive in question was from the beginning used in apposition in order to make specific a more general word such as *loca*, *aquae*. The situation is similar in the following examples, which have not received much attention: Formulae Turonenses (saec. VIII), c. 20 (MGH, Leg. sect. V, p. 146,19) *ut nostra voluntas a vis temporibus firmitus perduretur*; Coll. S. Dionysii 17 (ibid. p. 505,24) *Deus omnipotens vis temporibus ... vos ... custodiat*; TARDIF, Monuments p. 49 (A.D. 766) *ut ibidem a vis futuris temporibus proficiat in augmentis*.² The usage appears even earlier in the older Vita Wandregiseli (saec. VII ex.), c. 15 (MGH, Mer. V, p. 21,23) *in eua et lucolenta seo decorabile senectudine* 'in his advanced ... old age'. In a document of A.D. 866 from Verona³ we find a probably more accidental, somewhat pleonastic strengthening: *in alio tempore toto anno circulo*; and a little later: *que in toto anno circulo ... ibidem advenerit*.⁴

Constructions of this sort must have been much more common than our existing documents would lead us to believe. Certainly the Romance languages can show a large number of adjectives which are of substantival origin. An impressive collection of these is given in MEYER-LÜBKE II § 394 (and 390),

¹ It is possible that we have here a back-formation from the verb *stagnare* (SVENNUNG, op. cit. p. 638).

² Similar examples are quoted by DU CANGE s. v. *aevus*.

³ Cod. Dipl. Veronese, ed. V. PAINELLI (Venice 1940), no. 233, p. 357.

⁴ The adjectival *aevum* must have been influenced by *longaevus*. — We may note in passing that this use of *aevum*, mutatis mutandis, reminds one of the origin of *vetus*, which should properly be a substantive = Gr. *ἔτος*, dialect *ῥέτος* 'year'; *vetus vinum* 'year-old wine', etc. On the diminutive *anniculus* see F. SKUTSCH, ALL XV, p. 37.

cf. also III § 124. Examples are It. *fondo*, Span. *hondo* from Lat. *fundus*;¹ Prov. *pec* 'stupid' from *pecus* (cf. Fr. *bête* from *bestia*); O. Sp. *lince* 'keen-eyed' from *lynx*; Sp. *acedo*, Port. *azedo* (and other forms, MEYER-LÜBKE REW 98) 'sour' from *acetum*, which may perhaps have been used as an adjective in Vulgar Latin, cf. SVENNUNG, *Untersuch.*, p. 267, who very justly doubts whether we may not rather have to do with a vulgar misspelling of *acidus* as *acetum*, *acitum*. Finally, in illustration we may quote various colour-adjectives which are identical in form with the corresponding substantives, as It. *castagno*, Fr. *châtain* 'chestnut-brown', Fr. *violet*, etc.²

A like uncertainty exists on the boundaries between substantives and participles: in most languages the process of transition, for both present and perfect participles, follows rules which need not be specified here.³ I shall content myself with a few examples which seem to me to have some interest from the point of view of linguistic history. Among these is the substantival use of *discens*, which means both 'disciple' and 'beginner', 'novice', and can also signify a sort of recruit (see FIEBIGER in P.-W., vol. V, p. 1171), and is particularly common in the first two meanings.⁴ It occurs sometimes in good prose authors (Seneca, Quintilian, etc.), but in the later period at any rate belongs more to popular language. It is common in the Pompeian graffiti wall- and other inscriptions, as CIL IV 275 *Saturninus cum discentes*; 698 *Valentinus cum discentes suos* (the accusative after *cum* is typical of these inscriptions); VI 10009 *M. Aurelio Ianuario coniux et discentes fecerunt*; 10015 *posuit tabula(m) magister discenti*.⁵ In Christian writers (Tertullian and others) it is frequently applied to the disciples of Christ; but in Biblical language we only find it in the homely style of the Itala — the Vulgate always uses some alternative expression,⁶ which can scarcely be but by deliberate choice. A typical instance is Joh. 21,2 (cod. Cant.) *et alii de discipulis eius duo* (μαθητῶν; Vulg. *ex discipulis*); the Vulgate shows the same preference for

¹ Undoubtedly influenced by *profundus*.

² See above p. 120 on Fr. *lilas*, etc.

³ On Latin see HOFMANN, pp. 457 f.; NÄGELSBACH-MÜLLER, pp. 137 ff.; KÜHNER-STEGMANN I, pp. 222 ff. See also TOBLER, *Beitr.* II, pp. 177 ff.: 'Adjektiv in Substantivfunktion', where a number of participles is dealt with.

⁴ Cf. *Thes. L. Lat.* V:1, p. 1335,50 ff.; RÖNSCH, pp. 107 f.; KOFFMANN, p. 76.

⁵ CIL IV 2258 *condisce(n)s* is wrongly interpreted in *Thes. L. Lat.* IV 144,66; rightly by DIEHL, *Pompeian. Wandinschr.* 494.

⁶ It only occurs in a few places in individual manuscripts. — In *Timoth.* II 3,7 *discentes* is not a substantive, as context as well as comparison with the Greek text will show.

discipulus in Matth. 16,21; Luc. 22,45; Joh. 6,66; Act. Ap. 15,10; *ibid.* 1,15 the Itala (Cypr. epist. 67,4) reads: *in medio discentium*, where the Greek text has ἀδελφῶν and the Vulgate *fratrum*. The more vulgar language of later times is illustrated by Actus Petri cum Simone 41 *abstinuit manus suas a discentibus Dei et Christi*. Two examples, hitherto hardly noticed, occur in the apocryphal Epistle of Titus,¹ lines 281 and 305.

But the most frequent application of *discentes* was to learners or apprentices in handicrafts. The usage appears in the inscriptions cited, but more clearly in Test. Galli I 14 (CIL XIII 5708) *a tribus topiariis et discentibus eorum*; CIL VI 8659 *discentibus speclariaris*; XIII 7945 (A.D. 210) *discente* (sc. *architecti*); cf. also Digest. IX 2,5,3 *sutor ... puero discenti ingenuo filio familias ... cervicem percussit*. The word has survived in this meaning, cf. North It. dialect *descentre* (O. Lomb.), *desent* 'apprentice blacksmith'; also Sard. *dischente* (SALVIONI, Arch. glott. ital. XIV, p. 208).

There are other examples in Late Latin of substantivized and more or less petrified participles which are unknown to the usage of the classical period, and for various reasons some of them may claim our attention. One such example is *manens* 'inhabitant', 'resident', which we find in Cassiodorus' Variae IV 30,2 (p. 127,21) *ita fit, ut, quod per incuriam poterat labi, manentium videatur diligentia sustineri, quia facilis est aedificiorum ruina incollarum substracta custodia*. Here *manentes* is obviously equivalent to *habitatores* (TRAUBE's Index, p. 558 a). The meaning 'inhabitant' is found in Gregory of Tours, Vit. Patr. I 1 (p. 664,16), where he relates how two holy men pitched their tents in the desert, then afterwards returned: *relinquentes hoc habitaculum, quod expetierant, ad villas manentium sunt regressi*. Another interesting example, although considerably later, was first pointed out to me by Prof. KARL MICHAËLSSON, viz. in 'Polyptyque de l'abbaye de Saint-Germain des Prés, rédigé au temps de l'abbé Irminon'² II, p. 297: *Habet in Porto ecclesiam bene constructam. Aspiciunt ad ipsam ecclesiam de terra arabili bunuaria XXXIII ...; et aspicit ibi mansus I et dimidius. Sunt omnes desupra manentes III et hospites VI*. Other examples of *manentes* meaning *inquilini*, *coloni* from earlier and later medieval sources can be found in DUCANGE. From this stereotyped use of *manentes* are, as it seems, derived Fr.

¹ Edited by DE BRUYNE, Revue Bénédictine XXXVII (1925), pp. 48 ff. The notion that this usage suggests an African origin for the Epistula Titi (l. c. p. 70) is of course mistaken.

² Publié par AUGUSTE LONGNON, Paris 1886-1895. Irminon died about 826.

manant, Prov. *manen* 'resident' (in a secondary meaning also 'rich'), cf. MEYER-LÜBKE REW 5296. The word *manant* does not seem to be attested before the twelfth century, but the examples quoted will show that a tendency towards such a usage — and to my mind even the usage itself — is of considerably older date, and belongs to Late Latin.¹

The case of *habentes* 'the possessing' (cf. 'the possessing classes' and colloquial 'the haves') is rather a different one. Cassiodorus, for instance (Compl. in Act. Ap. 4,19 = PL 70, col. 1385 B), has: *ita ut nullus eorum aliqua indigentia premeretur, sed habentes gratanter dabant, quod omnibus in commune proficeret*. This seems to me to be a Graecism, and one peculiar to Christian writers. In classical times ὁ ἔχων, οἱ ἔχοντες signified the well-to-do, and this usage became important in Biblical language (BAUER, s. v.). A well known example is Luc. 19,26 παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται; Vulg. *omni habenti dabitur . . . , ab eo autem, qui non habet, et quod habet auferetur ab eo*; cf. also Matth. 25,29. From this starting point the spread of the expression was rapid to Christian language in general.²

Another interesting feature is the transformation of substantives into prepositions, of which Late Latin and the Romance tongues furnish some characteristic examples.³ I shall take first an expression which has not fully reached the final stage of this development. The Greek loanword *gyrus*, *girus*, which with its denominative *gyrare* established itself even in popular language, was commonly used in the prepositional phrases *in gyro* (*giro*), *per girum* (*giro*) 'round about'. This usage is not only attested in Aetheria, Oribas. Lat., Anthimus, and others, but appears in the Latin Bible, both Itala and Vulgate.⁴ Such a periphrasis of a preposition should logically be followed by a genitive,

¹ The verb *manere* and its derivatives are well attested in Gaul; cf., e. g., GODEFROY s. v. *manant*, *manoir*, *mes* (Prov. *mas*, from *mansum*, *mansus*), etc. A well known example is *mansio*, whence Fr. *maison*; cf. below p. 146.

² The fact that the negative ὁ μὴ ἔχων is not rendered by a participle, but by some circumlocution, suggests that the usage is secondary in Latin; cf. besides the passages quoted also I Cor. 11,22.

³ Peregr. Aeth., pp. 66 f.; SVENNUNG, Untersuchungen, pp. 332 ff.

⁴ Very often, though by no means always, *in giro*, etc. is found only in the Itala, being replaced in the Vulgate by the more polished *in circuitu*; for details see Thes. L. Lat. VI:2, 2386,30 ff.; 2388,40 ff. — How common this usage was may be judged from a striking amplification of it in early Medieval Latin: PFISTER, Kleine Texte zum Alexanderroman, p. 26,21 *silvam quae erat de giro in girum* ('around and about') *super ipsum lacum*; similarly p. 30,29.

as Peregr. Aeth. 13,3 *per girum ipsius colliculi parent fundamenta*; but vulgar usage is more accurately reflected by 14,2 *in giro colliculo isto*; 3,8 *in giro parietes ecclesiae*; 37,1 *stant in giro mensa diacones*. In such cases as these *in giro* has been in fact reduced to a preposition, and governs the usual cases, accusative and ablative, which at that time were phonetically identical.

The case of *de latus* is very similar. This expression, meaning 'by the side (of)' occurs sometimes adverbially, sometimes with a genitive following, according to the normal grammatical practice, as Gromatici¹ p. 324,11 *de latus rivi*; but just like *in giro* it acquires the function of a preposition, cf. ibid. 324,3 *de latus montem*; 319,12 *de latus casa*; 310,19 *de latus se*, etc. But here the development goes one stage further: *latus* comes to be used by itself as a preposition, 'alongside', 'beside', in the expression *latus se* (p.313,6; 313,19; 318,10). This is not an accidental, isolated case, as we may see from the Romance languages: cf. Prov. *latz*, O. Fr. *lez* 'beside', surviving in such place-names as *Passy-le z-Paris*, *Plessis-le z-Tours*, etc. Such a process may seem surprising, but we must remember that precisely the same development in pre-literary time must have produced the preposition *circum*, which is a stereotyped acc. form of *circus*; *incircum eum locum* in Varro, L. L. V 25 is apparently a relic of an earlier stage.

Two striking parallels from a late period are mentioned by SVENNUNG: firstly O. It., Prov. and Catal. *costa* 'beside', from the substantive *costa* 'side', secondly the hitherto unnoticed *litus* 'on the shore of' in Geographus Ravennas.² This writer sometimes uses the normal *iuxta litus maris*, *circa litus maris*, etc.,³ but more often simply *litus* by itself as a preposition. At first, as might be expected, the genitive is found, as III 9 *litus maris magni ponitur* ... *Mauritania Tingitana*; IV 6 *hae civitates litus maris Pontici sunt*; but then, partly under the influence of the synonymous *iuxta*, the construction of *litus* with the accusative is met with several times, as IV 22 *iuxta ipsam Liburniam, litus mare magnum, est patria, quae dicitur Istria*; IV 28 *litus mare*, etc.⁴

¹ I quote after the edition of LACHMANN.

² According to FUNAIOLI (P.-VV. II: 1, 309) from the seventh century; according to MOMMSEN the work did not receive its present form earlier than the ninth century; see MANITIUS, *Gesch. d. lat. Lit. des Mittelalters* I, p. 214.

³ Examples of this expression and the other in question are given by SVENNUNG, *Untersuch.*, pp. 334 f.

⁴ Also several times with the ablative (by analogy of *in* ?): V 25 *et litus finibus Apuliae est insula, quae* ...

On the much debated French *chez*, probably from *casa*, see especially VON WARTBURG FEW II 1, p. 452. DIEZ (Et. Wb. 546) was the first to offer the very convincing suggestion that this would have been shortened from *en chez*, cf. O. Sp. and O. Port. *a cas* 'in the house of'; sometimes also *en cas*. But the details are not entirely clear. A semantic parallel is provided by Swedish and Danish *hos* 'with', 'beside', an unstressed form of *hus* 'house'; cf. Old Swedish *i hoss* 'close to', 'near by'.

We need not go into details on the great changes in the nominal system which accompanied the rise of the Romance languages; some of them have received a great deal of attention and are sufficiently well known. The most striking feature is the elimination of the old genitive and dative, and their replacement by periphrases with *de* and *ad*. The decisive factor is the well-known and natural tendency towards an analytical structure, through a desire for clear and unambiguous expression.¹ But there were other shifts and interchanges of cases in Late Latin, many relatively unnoticed, which deserve some attention in view of their consequences in the fields of morphology and syntax.

One of these is the remarkable use of the genitive for the dative, which has some sporadic traces in classical times and becomes surprisingly widespread in later Latin. This usually happens when a substantive, instead of being put into the dative depending upon a verb, is put instead into the genitive and made to depend on another substantive in the same sentence. A full treatment of the subject, with extensive quotations, can be found in Syntactica I, pp. 214-222; cf. also NORBERG, Beiträge, pp. 34 ff. In some of the earlier examples proposals for emendation have been put forward, but without justice. The tendency is amply attested, develops steadily, and becomes exceedingly widespread during the period of transition from Latin to Romance. I shall cite enough examples to illustrate the main line of development; for further details the reader may consult the works mentioned. As early as Cicero's time we find in Ep. ad Fam. V 15,2 *quod vinclum, quaeso, deest nostrae coniunctionis?* De or. III 27,104 *ad fidem orationis faciendam*; Liv. III 46,2 *locum seditionis quaerere*; Quint. Decl. min. 270 (p. 105,19 RITTER) *qui vel unus attulerit mortem nocentis*; Tert. Adv. Hermog.

¹ On *de* and *ad* in this function see HOFMANN, p. 392; LÖFSTEDT, Syntactica I, pp. 187 ff.; MEYER-LÜBKE III §§ 44 and 45; for the Merovingian period LOUIS FURMAN SAS, The noun declension system in Merovingian Latin (Paris 1937), pp. 468 ff. et passim (see his Index).

22 *si tantam curam instructionis nostrae insumpsit*; ACO ed. SCHWARTZ II:2, p. 132,9 *ad contumeliam pontificis inrogandam*.¹

At a very late period, particularly in Merovingian and early Medieval Latin, this usage becomes much freer, amounting in many cases to a complete confounding of genitive and dative. I shall again be content with a few illustrative examples: Jordanes Get. 18,102 *ipsius urbis ferre subsidium gestiens*; Vita Hugberti 6 (MGH, Mer. VI, p. 486,19) *dedit alapam ipsius*; Liber. Hist. Franc. (MGH, Mer. II, p. 255,21) *quis tullit pauperi istius saccolum suum*; Fredegarius, Contin. 53 *multa elemosina tam ecclesiis quam monasteriis vel pauperum largitus est*; Liber Pontificalis I, p. 3,4 (ed. MOMMSEN) *episcopos ... qui ... omne ministerium sacerdotale in urbe Roma populo vel supervenientium exhiberent*; Cod. Dipl. Long. II, p. 331,8 (A.D. 771) *sicut ambarum partium placuit*; II, p. 220,11 (A.D. 767) *nobis totorum* ('to us all') *iustum comparuit, ut ...* Another common feature in documents of this period is the use of the genitive of pronouns — sing. *illius*, *ipsius*,² plur. *illorum*, *eorum*, etc. — to supply the function of the dative. We have already seen some of the first type; of the latter an example is provided by Fredegarius, Chron. III 51 *qui eorum auxiliare presumpserant*; frequent in Chron. Salernitanum, as p. 481,6 *praefuit illorum ferme unum ... annum*,³ 512,21 *dedit nomen illorum*; 514,47 *exinde eorum minime optemperavit*; 542,1 *viriliter illorum resistens*; 552,44 *quatenus veniam illorum tribueret*, etc. etc.

This remarkable usage, the outcome of so many centuries of development,⁴

¹ Several of these passages have been the prey of emendators, but they can be abundantly paralleled; see Syntactica I, pp. 215–217.

² On *huius* instead of *huic* see also NORBERG op. cit. p. 39, note.

³ Likewise *illorum* is often used with *praeesse*: p. 521,9; 549,4; 556,13, et passim.

⁴ It is worthy of note, and highly characteristic of the parallel development of late Latin and Late Greek, that a very similar phenomenon occurs in Greek also, where the dative is gradually replaced by the genitive. Thus in a Christian inscription we find ἀνέστησα τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου; this sort of construction is also attested in papyri and Byzantine documents. The final result is to be seen in modern Greek, where the dative has vanished from colloquial language, as for example ἔδωκε τῆς μικρῆς τὸ γράμμα 'he gave the letter to the little girl' (THUMB, Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache² § 54). On this phenomenon see Syntactica I, pp. 222 ff., where further bibliography is given. Cf. also DEBRUNNER, IF LI, p. 223, and for Medieval Latin documents from South Italy G. ROHLFS, Hist. Grammatik der unteritalienischen Gräzität (Sitz.-Ber. d. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1949, 4), p. 205. The works of HUMBERT and MERLIER (there cited) are of especial value. The reasons for the falling out of use of the dative case are

was of great importance for the Romance languages. It is only against the background of the Late Latin material that we can understand how *loro* in Italian, *lor* in Rumanian, *leur* in French, etc. (from Lat. *illorum*) came to serve both as genitive and dative. MEYER-LÜBKE II § 73, observes on this point: "Die darin zu Tage tretende Bedeutungsverschiebung ist syntaktisch kaum zu rechtfertigen, vielmehr findet sie ihre Erklärung lediglich in der Gestalt des Wortes: *illoru* eignete sich vermöge seiner grösseren Fülle besser zu einer betonten Form als *illis*, welches letzteres auf tonlosen Gebrauch beschränkt blieb." The first half of this judgment, as we have seen from the examples, cannot be maintained; in fact the slow, altogether organic development in Late and Vulgar Latin must have been the prime factor. We are also in a position to perceive the true origin — hitherto not satisfactorily explained — of the final -s in O. Prov. *lieis*¹ (from Vulgar Latin *illaeius*), an oblique case form alternating with *liei*; this also preserves a trace of the development in question. MEYER-LÜBKE remarks (II § 76): "Aber was soll ein Genitiv auf einem Gebiete, das den Dativ kaum kennt?" But in late Vulgar Latin *ipsius*, *illius*, etc. are used not only in dative functions,² but stand also, though less frequently, for accusative or ablative.³ In other words, it had become to some extent a generalized oblique case, a development in which no doubt some part was played by its form, differing from that of the ordinary nominal declension.

It may be added that the use of the genitive for the dative, as we have outlined it above, and the resulting confusion between the two cases are of the greatest importance for a clear understanding of Rumanian syntax. Here also genitive and dative have the same form, by TIKTIN called genitive-dative, which hitherto has not been easy to explain, but whose origin, as LERCH has pointed out, is to be sought in this same lack of distinction between the cases. For a detailed study of this and some related problems see his interesting contribution in *Syntactica* I, pp. 402 ff.

thus stated by SCHWYZER (*Neue Jahrbücher* XXI, 1908, p. 504): "Der dativische Gebrauch des Genetivs wird auf ähnlichen syntaktischen Verschiebungen beruhen wie im späteren Indischen und im Persischen, wo sich unabhängig die gleiche Entwicklung vollzogen hat." So it appears that the situation is the same as in Latin: another illustration of parallel but independent development in Latin and Greek. This independence does not of course exclude the possibility of some mutual interaction. Further details in *Syntactica* l. c.

¹ Cf. SCHULTZ-GORA, *Altprov. Elementarbuch*, § 115.

² Some examples given above; cf. also *Syntactica* I, p. 220; NORBERG, *op. cit.* p. 39.

³ *Syntactica* l. c. note 2, and especially PEI, pp. 171 f.

There are further instances in which some peculiarity of the Romance tongues can only be understood by a more profound study of Late and Vulgar Latin. Such an instance is the remarkable spread of the dative with verbs of asking, enquiring, entreating, and demanding. With increasing frequency from the time of Gregory of Tours onwards one finds in the Merovingian writers and in the early Middle Ages the tendency to use these verbs with a dative or with *ad* and the accusative. The causes are not difficult to guess. The normal *respondere alicui* becomes the model for an analogical *interrogare, quaerere alicui*; cf. Johannes Monachus, Liber de Miraculis, p. 64,8 HUBER (SMT 7) *cui dicam? cui queram? quid faciam?* In like fashion *flagitare* and *postulare* are construed with a dative on the model of *imperare, praecipere*, etc., and *supplicare alicui*, etc. brings into existence *obsecrare alicui, petere alicui*, etc. Some parallels from other languages will show how natural such a development is. In Middle Low German *vragen* is often construed with a dative on the analogy of verbs of telling or informing; cf. BEHAGHEL I, p. 616. More important is the fact that in Late and Byzantine Greek a number of verbs such as *αἰτεῖν, ζητεῖν, παρακαλεῖν, δεῖσθαι, πυνθάνεσθαι, ἐρωτᾶν*, and others are construed with the dative. This circumstance very strongly reminds us of the situation in Late Latin, but except in a very few cases, the possibility of influence is excluded. To some extent this 'Dativmanie' (KRUMBACHER) bears the stamp of artificiality.¹

At all events this dative in Late Latin established itself in the popular language, as the Romance development shows us. In Syntactica I, pp. 204 ff. I have collected extensive material, from which I need only make a representative selection to illustrate the main lines. The analogical influence seems to me very noticeable in Epist. Austras. 8 (sixth cent.): *te ... coniuro, ut hanc epistulam ... illi ... exponere studeas et ut ipsi interroges, Qui est Salvator?* Cf. also Greg. Turon. Hist. Franc. III 4 *cum uxori, quid sibi hoc vellit, interrogaret*, who uses it frequently after *interrogare*. Another rather common usage is *petere* with the dative, as in Jordanes, Get. 8,56 *vicinis gentibus concubitum petierunt*; St. Columban, Regula 10 *si quis contradicit fratri et non petit ei veniam*; more examples op. cit., p. 205; BONNET, p. 544; NORBERG, Synt. Forsch., p. 148 (even *poscere* with dative).

¹ Detailed treatment in Syntactica I, pp. 207 f. — Cf. also SCHMID, Atticismus III p. 56: "Je mehr er (i. e. der Dativ) faktisch in der gesprochenen Sprache aufhört, gebraucht zu werden, desto krampfhafter hält ihn die Schriftsprache fest und desto mehr Fehler werden in seiner Anwendung gemacht."

Instead of the dative we may find *ad* and the accusative, as Vita Amandi I 17 (MGH, Mer. V 441,17) *hi humiliter ad virum Dei petierunt, ut ... daret adsensum*. Out of the large number of verbs construed in this way, I shall cite only those which have left direct traces in the Romance languages¹:

precari with dative: Greg. Turon., Hist. Franc., Praef. p. 33,12 *veniam legentibus praecor, si ... grammaticam artem excessero*; Form. Sal. Merkel. 53 *precamus vobis ... de illa*. The same construction, although extinct in modern French, is found in Old French *prier*; cf. GODEFROY, Dictionnaire X, p. 417.

quaerere a) with dative: Greg. Turon., Vit. Patr. IX 1 *cui cum genitrix ... quaereret, quid hoc esset*; Gesta Romanorum 26 *si nobis queratur*: 'Quid est homo?', certe dicemus, quod ... Similarly O. Fr. *querre*, e. g., Chanson de Roland 3202: *jo vus otri quanque m'avez ci quis*; for other Romance languages see DIEZ, Gramm., p. 859.

b) with *ad* and accusative: Greg. Turon., De virt. Mart. II 25 *sanitatem ad te, non tormenta quaesivi*; Lex Curiensis (saec. VIII) II 9,1 *cartam ad eos quaerunt, ut ...* Similarly O. Fr. *querre*, e. g., Guernes, Vie de S. Thomas 1491 *quant a mei l'avez quis*.

rogare a) with dative: Cartae Senon. 18 (saec. VIII) *tibi rogamus, ut ... iustitia ... facias*; frequent in Cod. Dipl. Long., e. g., I 111,13 (A.D. 722) *amico meo ... rogavi*, etc.; Vita Willibaldi 4 (MGH Script. XV, p. 94,21) *ut rogarent illis viam*; ibid. (p. 100,6) *voluerunt rogare illis epistolam, ut ...*

b) with *ad* and accusative (infrequent): one example from Medieval Latin from Spain is given by DIEZ, Gramm. p. 860. Both constructions are alive in Romance times; on O. Fr. *rover* see the work of ELSA LANDIN (mentioned below), pp. 106 f.; for other Romance languages DIEZ op. cit. pp. 859 f.

The importance of these constructions in the Romance tongues can be assessed from the examples given; but one or two more examples may be added which give a particularly clear illustration. DIEZ p. 859 cites O. Fr. *un seul baisier d'amors li quier* (Lat. *illi quaero*); Prov. *merce quier a mon companho* (Lat. *quaero ad*); to this class also belongs Vie d'Alexie 61 *si li requierent conseil d'icele chose* (Lat. *illi requirunt*). More material has been collected by ELSA LANDIN in her detailed monograph, 'Étude sur les constructions de certains verbes exprimant la prière, la hâte et la

¹ More material and detailed bibliography in Syntactica I, p. 206.

nécessité en français' (Thèse, Uppsala 1938). Thus even so strange a construction — to English, German, or Scandinavian ears — as *demander quelque chose à quelqu'un*, if we compare it with the expressions above in which *ad* with the accusative is interchangeable with the dative, appears as the natural result of an organic syntactical development. The explanation advanced by HOFMANN, p. 498, that this construction arises from the phonetic convergence and ultimate confusion of *ab* and *ad*, cannot then be accepted as the sole explanation, although this factor doubtless contributed significantly to the development of the construction.¹

Another expression of disputed origin is the French *faire faire quelque chose à quelqu'un* and the like. A careful investigation indicates that this construction too has its roots in Late and Vulgar Latin, and is closely connected with the remarkably wide spread of the dative in certain constructions. The problem seems to me to have been solved by NORBERG in a detailed and acute study,² the results of which he sets forth with masterly clarity; but it would take too long to give the details or even the main lines of his conclusions. He succeeds in showing that earlier attempts at a solution put forward by leading Romance philologists paid too little attention to the Latin development, both in late and earlier Latin, and that the construction in essence "remonte à l'époque latine et doit être expliqué par la grammaire latine plutôt que par la grammaire romane" (op. cit., p. 91). The lesson to be drawn is an important one for methodology: without a thorough philological investigation of the material linguistic history cannot rise above mere schematism.

A good deal of interest, from the viewpoint both of the history and the psychology of language, attaches to certain stereotyped case forms which acquire various semantic and syntactical functions. Sometimes it is the frequency of their use, sometimes confusion between the parts of speech, especially in popular language, which causes their true nature to be less and less felt, and ultimately lost of sight. In Latin this phenomenon is well known in all periods of the language, and it has left many traces in the Romance languages.

To begin with the nominative, a transformation from predicative attribute to adverb is frequently met with; cf. BRUGMANN, IF XXVII, pp. 233 ff. (the material is important, but not all perfectly attested); HOFMANN, p. 468. Some early

¹ Cf. BONNET, pp. 543 and 447; NORBERG, Synt. Forsch., p. 150.

² DAG NORBERG, *Faire faire quelque chose à quelqu'un*, Uppsala Universitets Årskrift 1945, 12, pp. 65 ff.

and well known examples are *versus* (*vorsus*), *adversus* (*advorsus*), *prorsus* (from *pro-vorsus*), *rursus* (from *revorsus*), etc., which originate from the predicative use of the perfect participle. Thus Plautus, Pseud. 955 *ut transversus, non proversus cedit, quasi cancer solet*. A striking parallel development occurs at a later date — *rectus* used adverbially: Peregr. Aeth. 29,6 *revertuntur ergo omnes ad civitatem rectus ad Anastase, et fit lucernare iuxta consuetudinem*.¹ A further example of this sort is probably *mordicus*, an adjective which became stereotyped in the pre-literary period; in the case of *varicus* we can follow the process as it happens: Ovid Ars am. III 304 *illa ... ambulat ... varica*, but in Apuleius Met. I 13 *varicus super iaciem meam residentes*. On *praeceps*, *supplex*, etc. see Syntactica I, pp. 87 f.

The development of *voluntarius* is a striking one. In Classical Latin we often find *voluntaria mors*, *voluntaria deditio*, etc., but in Medieval Latin we find such a usage as Vita S. Viatoris 2 (Anal. Boll. XXIV, p. 99,6) *eia, domine abba, quod imperasti, voluntarius agam*. It is in such expressions as this, no doubt occurring also in somewhat earlier times, that we, in all probability, have to seek the origin of Fr. *volontiers* 'willingly' (see GRÖBER, ALL VI, p. 147).² Likewise we find in O. Fr. *premiers* (from *primarius*) used as an adverb, cf. MEYER-LÜBKE III § 493, where the parallel *primeiro* in Portuguese is cited. I do not know any direct precedent for this in Late Latin, but a rather similar expression is found in Acta Andr. et Matth. p. 39,11 BLATT (rec. Casanatensis, probably about the same period as Gregory of Tours) *etenim prior pertranseunt tres dies, quam ego valear pertingere illuc*. This reminds one strongly of English *prior to* = 'antérieurement à', but it is uncertain how far this may be directly connected with Latin. MURRAY, NED does not cite *prior to* before the eighteenth century, while *prior* as a substantive occurs much earlier. On indeclinable *uterque* see NORBERG, Eranos XXXV, pp. 116 ff.; on *idem* undeclined, serving the functions of the other cases, or sometimes petrified and equivalent to *item* see my Peregr. Aeth. pp. 295 f.; Mélanges ... off. à J. Marouzeau (Paris 1948), pp. 398 ff.

¹ With this *rectus* compare Greek *εὐθύς, ἰθύς*, which are properly nom. sing. masc. of an adjective, but have acquired adverbial function (BRUGMANN-THUMB, p. 294; SCHWYZER I, p. 620).

² The vocalism in Old French *volentiers*, Prov. and Catal. *volenter* and similar forms can be easily enough explained by the influence (already in Vulgar Latin?) of the adverb *volenter* and the participle *volent-em*. — A rather different explanation is offered by MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 9437.

In the rather chaotic state of the language in the transitional period we find some other nominatives which are difficult to characterize. They might be pure barbarisms, that is to say simple mistakes; or they may genuinely belong to the popular language. One of these uncertain cases is the strange *completus* (vulgar spelling *cumpletus*) in some passages of Cod. Dipl. Long.; cf. I p. 90,14 (A.D. 720) *et constant (i. e. constat) me in omnibus esse suppletus, et nihil mihi in amplius pretium reddevire videris; set omnia mihi cumpletus pariaſti* ('completely', 'entirely');¹ the same expression recurs p. 150,14 and 153,22 (both from A.D. 730).

There is a special class of expressions in which one or other element of a 'double-barrelled' name ceases to be declined. In Cod. Dipl. Long. I, p. 136,1 (A.D. 726/727) we find: *regnante dominus Leoprando, viro excellentissimo rege in Italia*. Apparently the reason for the nominative *dominus* is not to be sought in the word itself, but in the fact that *dominus Leoprandus* is considered and treated as a single expression, and the first half therefore ceases to be declined. A parallel occurs in Chron. Salernitanum (MGH, Script. III) p. 475,19 *qui ab eodem rex Aystulfo Tusciae in partes erat directus*, where *rex Aystulfus* works as a declensional unit. A rather similar tendency appears in Benedicti Chron. (MGH, ibid.), p. 707,44 *a Karolus magno*, but the correct forms *Karolomagno*, *Karlomagno*, etc. are more common in this work. Cod. Dipl. Long. I, p. 176,2 (A.D. 735) presents a de facto analogy: *anno rigni (i. e. regni) eius vigisimus tertio*, from a *vigesimus tertius* written or thought of as one word (cf. Eng. *twenty-third*, Germ. *dreißundzwanzigst*, where the ordinal suffix is only added to the second element). On the other hand we find some examples of the much rarer phenomenon in which only the first member of such a pair is declined. Thus Mulom. Chir. 535 gives us a unique genitive *vini vetus* from the common *vinum vetus*. Here it is apparently the word *vetus* which sometimes tends to become monoptote; SVENNUNG² compares *in Urbevetus*, *Urbemvetus* (whence modern *Orvieto*)³ mentioned by PETSCHENIG in ALL X, p. 532.

Where there is an ellipsis of an idea that is closely related psychologically

¹ For *pariare* meaning 'count out' see DU CANGE s. v.

² Untersuch., p. 195.

³ In the Additamentum to the Chronicon of Marcellinus (MGH, AA XI) for the year 536 we read (p. 104,34): *opes . . . quas in Insula vel in Urbevetus congregaverat*; for the year 538 (p. 106,6) *in deditione suscipit Urbiniū et Urbemvetus et insulam lacus Vulsinensis*. On a rather uncertain reading *Epiro vetus* see PETSCHENIG l. c.

or has a dominating influence over the context, a genitive can be found in a number of languages standing independently, given the special circumstances required. A familiar example is Horace's *ventum erat ad Vestae* (sc. *aedem, templum*); cf. Eng. *at St. Paul's* (sc. *cathedral*), etc.¹ This usage is very common also in Late and Medieval Latin: I shall quote some examples (hitherto, I believe, unnoticed) from religious contexts. *Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium* 26 (MGH, Script. VIII, p. 536,10) *nam et Parisius*² *aliquandiu a p u d S a n c t i Germani* (Saint-Germain!) *operam dedit et studio et sanctae . . . religioni*; *Miracula S. Herculani* (Anal. Boll. XI, p. 244) *facere suum miraculum in Sancti Benedicti*; *ibid.* (p. 246) *lux de caelo veniens percussit eum in equite*,³ *Nativitatis Domini depraedari euntem* (sc. *ecclesiam*).

More surprise may be occasioned by the elliptical use of the genitive in citing titles of books, as Serv. ad Verg. Aen. III 637 *quia Graecorum clipei rotundi, ut Cato Originum ait* (for *in libris Originum* vel sim.); likewise Charisius, p. 202,26 (KEIL) '*impariter*': *Horatius Epistolarum* '*versibus impariter iunctis*'. Conjectural additions are idle, as VAHLEN established in his masterly treatment of these passages (Op. Ac. II, pp. 335 f.). I shall add two instructive examples: Sen. contr. exc. 3,7 *Ovidius in libris Metamorphoseon dicit*; but the scholiast on Persius 6,52 has: *Ovidius in Metamorphoseon ait*. This usage is common also in Christian literature; thus we often find *Regnorum* used for the books which the Vulgate calls *libri Regum*; cf. Didasc. Apost. 4,10 (p. 6 HAULER) *legis . . . evangelium et Prophetas nec non et Regnorum*; *ibid.* 3,8 (p. 4); Pelagius, Expos. in Ep. ad Rom. 11,2 *in Regnorum, ubi scriptum est de Helia*; similarly in I Cor. 7,5 *in Regnorum*.⁴ We also frequently meet in medieval authors

¹ Bibliography in Syntactica II, pp. 249 ff.; cf. esp. A. E. H. SWAEN, The elliptical genitive, in: A grammatical miscellany, offered to Otto Jespersen, Copenhagen 1930, pp. 275 ff.; W. STEINHAUSER, Die genetivischen Ortsnamen in Oesterreich, Sitz.-Ber. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl. 206,1 (1927). The same usage appears in English place-names: St. Ives, St. Andrews, etc.; see SWAEN, p. 281.

² On the form *Parisius* see below p. 136.

³ On *eques* meaning *equus* see KLOTZ, ALL XIV, pp. 126 ff.; SVENNUNG, Oros., p. 117; MÜLLER-MARQUARDT, Die Sprache der alten Vita Wandregiseli (Halle 1912), p. 138. An example from the Middle Ages occurs in Ordo Romanus XI (a little before 1143), MIGNE, PL 78, 1042 A: *cardinales vero ita induti cum equitibus revertuntur ad titulos suos* (see MIGNE's note).

⁴ SOUTER in Texts and Studies IX 1, p. 84; E. TIDNER, Sprachlicher Kommentar zur lateinischen Didasc. Apost. (Stockholm 1938), p. 41.

Sacramentorum for *liber Sacramentorum*, e. g., Ordo Romanus I, Append. (MIGNE PL 78, 960 C) *ordine quo in Sacramentorum continetur*; *ibid.* 961 A and C: *sicut in Sacramentorum continetur*. In the Regula Benedicti 11 the best manuscripts read: *tria cantica de Prophetarum* (the inferior mss. have *de Prophetis* or simply *Prophetarum* without the preposition); *ibid.* 13: *sabbatorum* = *sabbatorum die* (some mss. give the normalized *sabbato*). In both these passages LINDERBAUER rightly adopts the *lectio difficilior*; see his commentary pp. 241; 246.

The use of *sabbatorum*¹ brings us to a further group of genitives akin to those we have seen: a group in which there is an ellipsis of *dies* or *tempus* or *festum*. Beside *sabbatorum* which may have been formally influenced by *Sacramentorum*, *Regnorum*, etc., although such a supposition is hardly necessary, we find a number of forms which are of some interest to the Romance philologist. From *martyrorum*, which occurs in inscriptions as a by-form of *martyrum*, comes the Provençal substantive *martror*; analogous are *pascor* 'spring' and *calendor* 'Christmas' from **paschorum* and **calendorum* respectively (from the correct form *calendarum* are derived Rum. *cărindar* 'January', Prov. *calendar* 'the last day of the month').² Cf. also Prov. *candelor*, Fr. *chandeleur* 'Candlemas' from (*festum*) *candelarum*,³ with altered suffix, which might also be expressed by saying that under the influence of connected words like *martror*, *pascor* the suffix *-or* became productive in this special class of expression. The view of SPITZER (Aufsätze, p. 180) is that such phrases as *sancta sanctorum*, *saecula saeculorum* provided the main starting point for the whole development, but it is hard to see why *martyrorum*, for example, which is actually attested in Vulgar Latin, should have been influenced by this particular and special class of expression. The factors to which I have referred seem to offer a satisfactory explanation.⁴

¹ On this form see also SPITZER, *Vox Romanica* II, p. 205, who quotes the following from Augustine: *quarta sabbatorum, quarta feria, qui Mercurii dies ... dicitur*.

² Cf. SCHULTZ-GORA, *Altprov. Elementarbuch*³, p. 64; MEYER-LÜBKE REW 1508. In the same connexion see also RHEINFELDER, *Kultsprache und Profansprache*, pp. 444-448 with an interesting and detailed study of the way in which *pascha* in southern Europe 'par extension' came to signify other feasts besides Easter. On the formal aspect of the question he remarks in passing (p. 446, n.) that the obsolescent Modern Provençal *pasco clauso* presupposes a *pasco* 'Easter'.

³ See MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 1578; VON WARTBURG, FEW II:1, pp. 179 f. on this and related forms.

⁴ SPITZER also now seems to hold a similar opinion, cf. *Vox Rom.* II, p. 205.

Another stereotyped form, and a rather striking one, is *Parisius*. In late and somewhat vulgar texts we commonly find such expressions as the following: Greg. Turon., Hist. Franc. IV 22 (p. 159,5) *deditque sors Charibertum . . . sedem habere Parisius*; IV 49 (p. 184,20) *vicos qui circa Parisius erant*; IV 50 (p. 185,15) *Parisius venit*; more examples of a similar kind are given by BONNET, p. 571. Certain scholars¹ have treated these and similar examples as scribal blunders, and have classicized the syntax by writing *Parisios*, *Parisiis* as the case required. This notion was rebutted by W. HERAEUS, one of the greatest authorities of his generation on Late and Vulgar Latin, who gave a clear and convincing account of the anomalous *Parisius* and similar forms.² He observes that *Parisii* was at first an ethnic name, like *Turoni*, *Remi*, etc., but came to be used as a local name: *Parisios venit* just like *Veios venit*, *Delphos venit*. Then gradually in the case of *Parisios* the vulgar misspelling *-us* for *-os* became established — a phonetic development which occurs elsewhere, but is peculiarly frequent in Gaul; finally the form *Parisius* was stereotyped and used for all cases.³ A similar explanation must be sought in the case of *Turonus* (Tours), *Remus* (Rheims), etc.; cf. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, *La déclinaison latine en Gaule à l'époque mérovingienne* (Paris 1872), pp. 62 ff.

The undesirability of emendation is further underlined, as HERAEUS points out, by poetical examples, where the form is guaranteed by the metre, as Ven. Fortunatus, Carm. IV 26,13 where *Vilithuta* is declared to have been *sanguine nobilium generata Parisius urbe*; *ibid.* VI 2,9 (in a panegyric on King Charibert) *dilige regnantem celsa, Parisius, arce*, etc. In the *Notae Tironianae* already we find lists of names such as *Arvennus*, *Augustonemetum*, *Parisius*, *Luticia*, *Turonus*, *Caesarodunum*, etc.; cf. HERAEUS *op. cit.* 1238. In the Middle Ages such examples as *Parisius*, *Turonus*, *Treverus*, etc. are very common; the seal of a merchant guild of Paris is inscribed *Sigillum mercatorum aque Parisius*, and according to HERAEUS we still find documents dated *Parisius* in the sixteenth century. In an adulatory poem addressed to Louis the Pious (HAUPT, *Opusc.* I, p. 288) we find: *inde Turonus adit, Martini culmina celsi / visere . . .*; and in Greg. Turon. Hist. Franc.

¹ See DRÄSEKE, *Wochenschrift f. klass. Philol.* (1916), pp. 809 ff.

² *Ibid.* pp. 1237 ff.

³ BONNET, *l. c.* remarks with justice on *Parisius* and similar forms that they are "des monoptotes remplissant toute sorte de fonctions, et accompagnés ou non de prépositions diverses."

II 38 (p. 102,14) two indeclinable forms occur together: *egressus autem a Turonus, Parisius venit*.

Further material is given by BLATT in 'In memoriam Kr. Sandfeld' (Copenhagen 1943), pp. 47 ff., who takes as his starting point an early printed book entitled *Articuli in Anglia et Parisius condemnati* (Cologne c. 1490). In connexion with this he considers a number of other case-forms, particularly ablatives¹ — originally no doubt local ablatives — which have become stereotyped as placenames, as *Aurelianis* (Orléans) beside *Aurelianus*,² etc. I cannot go into the details of this question, interesting though as it is, nor yet into the question of the influence of the Vulgate on this usage, which to my mind is rather overstated by BLATT.³ But the general linguistic interest of such forms as *Parisius*, *Turonus*, etc. lies in the fact that local expressions denoting direction often tend to be used mechanically and even to give rise to new forms of the name, as *Istambul* (*Stambul*) from (εἰς) τὴν πόλιν,⁴ *Isnik* from εἰς Νίκαιαν,⁵ etc.

This feature is particularly common in certain non-Roman names, as for example those in *-polim*. *Constantinopolim* is very frequent in various functions: 'at', 'in', 'to', or 'from Constantinople'. SCHWARTZ, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* provides numerous examples, which may instructively be compared with their Greek originals. I shall confine myself here to vol. I : 3, containing the first part of the so-called Synodicum of Rusticus (a Latin translation of the *Gesta Ephesena*). Thus p. 40,4 *de Constantinopolim ad Antiochiam venientium*, but in the Greek text ἀπὸ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν; p. 56,25 *prolatae sunt de Constantinopolim*, where

¹ The same happens to some locatives, as *Tiburi* (Tivoli), *Brundisii* (Brindisi), *Agrigenti* (Girgenti), etc.; cf. B. BIANCHI, *Archivio glottologico Italiano* IX, p. 378 f.; GRANDGENT, *From Latin to Italian*, § 161; BATTISTI, *Avviamento*, p. 200. This view, first put forward by DIEZ, is regarded with some scepticism by ROHLFS (*Hist. Gramm. d. ital. Spr.* II, p. 26), who thinks that closer examination is called for.

² HERAEUS l. c. 1239; Index to ARNDT and KRUSCH's edition of Gregory of Tours, p. 887; A. LONGNON, *Géographie de la Gaule au VI^e siècle* (Paris 1878), p. 343.

³ He considers that Biblical names, such as *Bethleem*, *Capharnaum*, *Nazareth*, which could not easily be brought into the Latin declensional system, contributed largely to the stereotyping of placenames in Late Latin. Of course this influence cannot be ruled out, but I would not willingly assign any great importance to it.

⁴ On this name and its explanation see KRETSCHMER, *Glotta* XVI, p. 184 f. He adds i. a.: "So ist auch 'εἰς τὴν Κῶ = Κῶς zu **Istankō* (ital. *Istanchio*) geworden, daraus mit Anlehnung an türk. *kōi* 'Dorf', *Istankōi*."

⁵ Other local expressions, naturally, can give rise to a similar development: *Andermatt* from *an der Matt*, etc., cf. BLATT l. c. 53.

the Greek has ἀπὸ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως; p. 90,26 *episcoporum qui inventi sunt Constantinopolim* = εὐρεθέντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει; p. 91,8 *terrae motis saepe factis Constantinopolim* = ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει; p. 106,33 *defendit autem Constantinopolim res eiusdem ecclesiae* = ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει; p. 140,2 *qui inventi sunt in Constantinopolim* and 140,6 *qui in amica Christo Constantinopolim sunt inventi*, but in the Greek text in both cases ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει.¹ Other examples of indeclinable *Constantinopolim* from Epist. Avell., Jordanes, Anon. Valesianus, and others are given by NORBERG, Beiträge, pp. 52 f.

Occasionally we find *metropolim* used in like fashion.² Cf. Acta Conc. Oecum. I: 3, p. 119,18 *synodo celebrata in Ephesiorum metropolin* = ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλει; p. 140,4 *congregatis ... in Ephesena metropolim* = ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλει. A stereotyped *Neapolim* has been observed by NORBERG in several places in the correspondence of Gregory the Great, as Ep. IX 54 (II p. 79,10) *monasterium quod Neapolim in domo ... Felicis ... constitutum est*. Many examples might be added from medieval texts, as the Chronicon Vulturense³ (beginning of the twelfth century); cf. I, p. 361,16 *per idem tempus Athanasius presul Neapolim militum magister preerat*; II, p. 99,5 *a Deo protecta civitate nostra Neapolim* (in a document of A.D. 944); p. 101,23 *in suprascripta civitate nostra Neapolim* (in the same document). Some more isolated examples of similar names in *-polim* are given by NORBERG l. c.

In the sphere of numerals the 'embarras de richesse' in Classical Latin is well known. Apart from the cardinals and ordinals there is the full range of distributives (*bini, deni, centeni*, etc.), to say nothing of the multiplicative adverbs. Here I shall simply note a remarkable development of the distributives and an extension of their use, which has left its mark upon the Romance languages, especially Spanish, but which has received less than its due share of attention.

The normal use of the forms in question is partly as pure distributives (as Plaut., Aul. frag. 3 *ecfodiebam in die denos scrobes*), partly as multiplicative, e. g., Verg. Aen. I 381 *bis denis ... navibus*; Ov. Met. VII 293 *ante*

¹ On the other hand the genitive is given quite correctly p. 141,10 *a clero Constantinopoleos*.

² But the correct forms of *metropolis* are more common, cf., e. g., I:2, p. 75,13; I:3, p. 51,18.

³ Ed. V. FEDERICI, Fonti LVIII-LIX (1925-1940).

quater denos . . . annos. But from constructions like *bis deni* there arises the use of *deni* by itself to mean *decem*, a usage which is particularly common in poetry and post-classical prose,¹ as Verg. Aen. V 85 *septem ingens gyros, septena volumina traxit*, etc.; cf. HOFMANN, p. 493; KÜHNER-STEGMANN I, pp. 661 f.; SVENNUNG, Untersuch., p. 293; more examples in NEUE-WAGENER II, pp. 331 ff. To some extent the predisposing causes are metrical, but more important was the tendency of poetry and the high style to eliminate the common and everyday cardinal numbers. Thus the periphrases *bis sex* or *bis seni*, *ter decem* or *ter deni*, *ter centum* or *ter centeni*, etc.² come into use, and the true distinction between *sex* and *seni*, *decem* and *deni* is almost necessarily to a large extent obscured.

In Medieval Latin this use of the distributives is very common. Sometimes the desire for a declinable form rather than an indeclinable may have influenced the decision. I append a number of examples from different periods. Adamnan, Life of Columba (saec. VII) II 39 (p. 152,3 FOWLER) *post septenorum, sicut tibi dictum est, expletionem annorum*; III 23 (p. 181,23) *senis intervenientibus continuis diebus*; III 23 (p. 186,8) *ternis diebus et totidem noctibus* (but p. 186,14 *tribus*); cf. also I 1 (p. 92,25); I 12 (p. 100,11); I 31 (p. 108,37); I 33 (p. 110,18); I 41 (p. 115,19) et passim; Adamnan, De locis sanctis, e. g., II 27 (CSEL XXXIX, p. 275,14) *in eadem . . . planitie . . . ternae sunt fundatae celebres ecclesiae* (but p. 275,18 *tria tabernacula*, and p. 275,20 *trium ecclesiarum aedificia*); similarly *duodeni* for *duodecim* II 15 (p. 264,12 and 265,6), etc.; Autperti Vita Paldonis etc. (MGH, Lang.; saec. VIII) c. 14, p. 553,38 *undenis actis . . . annis*; Anastasius' translation of the Chronographia of Theophanes Confessor (ed. DE BOOR; saec. IX), p. 111,29 *turbationum dena milia excitat* (the Greek text has *δεκάβους μυρίους*); p. 266,33 *in denis milibus (μυρίους) latrunculis*;³ Disputatio Pippini cum Albino,⁴ 100, p. 142 (saec. IX) *vidi hominem octo in manu tenentem, et de octonis subito rapuit septem, et remanserunt sex*; Historia S. Ursulae (Anal. Boll. III; saec. X), p. 12,9 *denas spectatissimae stirpis, ut ego sim*

¹ Sometimes even in more popular language: cf. CIL XI 2538 *vixit . . . an(nis) LXII, mens. VIII, (diebus) numero deni(s) (i. e. decem)*.

² On this stylistic tendency see the acute and interesting observations of WIFSTRAND, Tider och stilar (Lund 1944), pp. 107 ff.

³ But immediately before *nonaginta milibus*, and just afterwards *viginti milibus* and *sexaginta milibus*.

⁴ Illinois Studies in Lang. and Literature, vol. XXIV:1.

undecima, virgines; *ibid.* 7,28; 13,8. Further examples would be unnecessary; there is no doubt as to the wide spread of the usage in the Middle Ages, even in prose authors.

A less known usage, and one less common in classical times, is that of the distributives instead of ordinals. The causes here are the same as those sketched above: metrical reasons are especially obvious in the earlier examples.¹ This phenomenon, which is not mentioned in the major text-books (as HOFMANN's *Syntax*), has been studied by BLATT,² but seems to deserve a more detailed treatment. The medieval examples are in fact fairly numerous³: *Gesta Romanorum* ed. OESTERLEY, p. 366,17 *puella ista cum ad etatem d e n a m pervenisset* ('to her tenth year'); *Ysengrimus*, ed. VOIGT p. 428; *Carmen de elev. corporis S. Frodoberti abbatis* (*Anal. Boll.* V), p. 63,26 *lucem d u o d e n a m, | quam lector Martis sibi calculat ante Kalendas*; *Andreae Sunonis fil. Hexaëmeron* (c. 1200; ed. GERTZ 1892), v. 682:

*at cum luna vice d u o d e n a lampade fratris
coeperit accendi, lunarem perficit annum.*

Similarly v. 1952 *septena dies* and 6457 *septena luce*, i. e. *septima*. In giving the date this usage is particularly common, as in the little poem *De sancto Kanuto duce*⁴ v. 1 *anno milleno centeno ter quoque deno* (i. e. A.D. 1130);⁵ v. 3 *septenis Ydibus*; *Script. min. hist. Dan. medii aevi* (ed. GERTZ) II:1 p. 287 *anno milleno bis centenoque noveno | a nato Christo ...*

¹ *Thes. L. Lat.* III 816,73 ff. quotes only four examples of *centenus* meaning *centesimus*, all from Late Latin (Jerome, Alcimus Avitus, Corippus). Three of these are poetical, and in all three the corresponding form of *centesimus* would not be got into a hexameter.

² *Fra Cicero til Copernicus* (Copenhagen 1940), pp. 116 ff.

³ We may perhaps be justified in reading already in Ovid. *Her.* XI 45 (47) f.:

*iam noviens erat orta soror pulcherrima Phoebi,
d e n a que luciferos Luna movebat equos.*

One of the principal manuscripts has *nonaque*, and some critics have read *denique* or *plenaque*. A similar usage is probably found in Martial VIII 45,4 *amphora centeno consule facta minor* (i. e. 'degustata' or perhaps 'decollata'); again in BÜCHELER, CE 711. Both *decima* and *centesimo* are metrically impossible in the respective passages. Unequivocal examples of *septenus* meaning *septimus* occur in Apuleius, *Apol.* 9, and in Ausonius. They are recognized also by HOUSMAN in his extremely erudite and, with regard to Ovid and Martial, sceptical note on Manilius IV 451.

⁴ GERTZ, *Vitae sanctorum Danorum*, p. 220.

⁵ It must be remembered of course that neither *millesimo* nor *centesimo* can be fitted into a correct hexameter. The same applies to many of the examples.

Further examples from later medieval authors are given by BLATT *op cit.* p. 116, e. g., from a French manuscript (THUROT, p. 27, ms. Saint-Victor 927):

*Anno milleno cum quondam septuageno
et bis centeno Maio liber hic fit ameno.*

Examples of *novenus*, *denus*, and *centenus* used as ordinals are given by BAXTER-JOHNSON (from the twelfth to the sixteenth century) and other authorities.

In these various ways the use of the distributives became a great deal wider in Late and Medieval Latin,¹ and in doing so it left traces in the Romance languages. BLATT refers us to MEYER-LÜBKE II § 561 on the formation of the ordinals in Italian: "Das Italienische folgt dem Lateinischen genau: *primo*, *secondo*, *terzo* . . . *nono*, *decimo* . . . Davon weicht nun der ganze Norden von Venedig bis Genua ab, indem er von den Distributiven *-eno* übernimmt: *cinqueno*, *sexeno*, *seteno*, *ogeno*, *noveno*, *deseno* . . ., und so in allen mittelalterlichen Texten aus Norditalien."² The suffix *-eno* has thus become productive, and in *noveno* I can only see a direct continuation of Latin *novenus*. The same holds good for Spanish, but has not received equal notice: thus *noveno*³ means 'the ninth', and *la novena* is an important expression, especially in Old Spanish, *la novena parte* signifying a tax amounting to one ninth of a man's income. On this and other meanings of the word see DU CANGE s. v.; G. TILANDER, *Los Fueros de la Novenera*,⁴ pp. 185 f. A similar formation is *septena*, which DU CANGE tells us can mean "septima pars fructuum ex agris vineisve domino persolvenda."⁵ Some interest attaches to the ordinal meaning 'hundredth': *centeno* or *centesimo*. In this case the original Latin distributive and ordinal

¹ The following expression in the *Ordo Romanus* I, Appendix (saec. IX?), MIGNE PL 78, 96+ C is very remarkable: *deinde schola iussa facit litaniam ante altare: primam septenam; spatio facto faciunt alteram quinam; intervallo facto faciunt tertiam ternam*. The meaning is that the litany shall be recited first seven, then five, finally three times, cf. J. A. JUNGSMANN, *Missarum Sollemnia* I (Wien 1948), p. 419 and 404; II p. 408 f.

² This last observation seems to me, from my own knowledge of the material, rather exaggerated.

³ *deceno* and *onceno* (MEYER-LÜBKE l. c.) show the spread of the suffix *-eno*.

⁴ *Leges Hispanicae medii aevi*, ed. cur. GUNNAR TILANDER, II, Stockholm 1951. On *noveno* and the Old Spanish *beynteno* 'twentieth', formed with the same suffix, see also M. GOROSCH, *El Fuero de Teruel* (*Leges Hisp.* I, Stockholm 1950, pp. 54 f.).

⁵ In modern Spanish *una septena de* means a set of seven of anything.

are both preserved side by side — a striking testimony to the protracted competition between the two forms.

According to VISING (*Romania L*, pp. 493 f.), the ordinals belong to the language of learning or advanced culture, and are in large measure lacking on a more primitive stage.¹ If this be so, it is easier to understand why certain Late Latin forms of this kind remained virtually unaltered. Ecclesiastical, legal, and administrative language must have exerted a great and often decisive influence.

¹ On the formation of the ordinals in more out-of-the-way and primitive languages see VISING l. c. and especially the recent work of E. BENVENISTE, *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indoeuropéen* (Paris 1948), pp. 145 ff.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHANGES IN THE MEANING OF WORDS

Great as is the importance of morphological and syntactical developments, no less importance, and often greater interest, where the history of ideas is concerned, attaches to changes in the meaning of words. The problems arising in this connexion are fundamental to the science of semasiology, and have received close attention in our generation. Valuable observations and examples are offered in two widely known works, BRÉAL, *Essai de sémantique* (1897) and DARMESTETER, *La vie des mots* (1. ed. 1886; 12. ed. 1918), both still interesting although somewhat out of date. In more recent years a great variety of works has appeared upon the subject, both specialist monographs and more general treatments. In some cases I feel that philosophical and psychological speculation has been given too free a rein, and not enough heed has been paid to historical and cultural considerations.¹ New principles of classification based upon the more or less accepted doctrines of modern psychology may sometimes be useful, but the immense richness of human experience, speech, and thought cannot be caught within a net of abstractions, no matter how fine the cords may be spun.

From the number of important works of recent years I shall here mention only a few: a more detailed bibliography will be given below.² On the classical languages, e. g., E. STRUCK, *Bedeutungslehre, Grundzüge einer lateinischen*

¹ For a brilliant example of a semasiological study which never loses sight of broader cultural considerations see H. RHEINFELDER, *Das Wort persona. Geschichte seiner Bedeutungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des französischen und italienischen Mittelalters* (Halle 1928, Beihefte zur ZRPh, H. LXXVII).

² Cf. PAUL, *Prinzipien*, pp. 74 ff.; LEUMANN, *Zum Mechanismus des Bedeutungswandels*, IF XLV (1927), pp. 105 ff.; HOFMANN, pp. 22 ff.; ROHLFS, *Roman. Philologie I*, p. 34.

und griechischen Semasiologie (Leipzig-Berlin 1940); for the Romance languages KR. NYROP, Grammaire historique de la langue française, Tome IV (1913); E. GAMILLSCHEG, Französische Bedeutungslehre (Tübingen 1951); for a general outline of the subject H. KRONASSER, Handbuch der Semasiologie (Heidelberg 1952).¹

A matter of common occurrence in all languages is transference from concrete to abstract meaning and vice versa.² The language of primitive and uneducated peoples, as HAYERS (Handbuch, pp. 108 f.; 147) and others have remarked, is remarkably concrete, and free from abstract expressions. Here is the basis for the well known fact that in all languages there are so many words which start with a concrete and individual content, then in the course of time lose their clear outline, become generalized or associated with other concepts, and finally become abstract or metaphorical. An important part is played in this process by metonymy and especially by metaphor: indeed a Swedish poet put it neatly, if rather too strongly, when he described language as a gallery of faded metaphors. We have already met prepositions which were originally stereotyped case forms of substantives, often with local meaning³ — cf. p. 125 on Latin *circum* from *circus*, O. Fr. *lez* 'beside' from Lat. *latus*, etc. Greek *γλῶσσα* and Latin *lingua* mean 'tongue' at first, later also 'speech', 'language'; the same development occurs in English *tongue*, Sw. *tunga*, Germ. *Zunge*. The word *rubrica*, strictly an elliptical expression for *rubrica terra*, meant at first 'red earth', 'red chalk', then came to mean the superscription written in red over a law, until at last it could even be applied to the law itself. Likewise *stilus* was originally 'a pointed object', then it was applied specially to the sharp point used for writing; finally it meant 'writing', 'style'. The verb *comprehendere*, originally 'to grip', 'to grasp', gradually took on the meaning *intellegere et animo comprehendere*; cf. Fr. *comprendre*.

¹ Valuable and detailed bibliography; exposition at times rather abstract; cf., e. g., the tables on pp. 151 f. on "Ürsynästhesien und eigentliche Synästhesien."

² Cf. HOFMANN, pp. 792 f.; SVENNUNG, Untersuch., pp. 517 ff.; my Peregr. Aeth., pp. 110 ff.; Verm. Stud., pp. 211 ff.; GAMILLSCHEG, op. cit., pp. 73 ff.; KRONASSER, op. cit., pp. 121 f.; 127 ff.; ERNOUT, Aspects du vocabulaire latin, Paris 1954, p. 179 ff. Some interesting examples, principally from the Scandinavian languages, are given by V. DAHLERUP, Abstrakter og konkreter, Dania X, pp. 65 ff.; C. COLLIN, Semasiologiska studier över abstrakter och konkreter, in the publication Från Filologiska föreningen i Lund: Språkliga uppsatser III (1906), pp. 225 ff. — Other types of semantic change are dealt with on pp. 72 ff. and below pp. 156 ff.

³ Cf. DAHLERUP l. c., pp. 71 f.

In English *grip* cannot mean 'understand' although *grasp* can; but cf. Germ. *begreifen*, Sw. *begripa* from *greifen* and *gripa* respectively. It is common knowledge that *red* in English and *rouge* in French and corresponding adjectives in other languages,¹ through historical accidents, have come to mean 'radical', 'revolutionary'.

Such examples as these have already introduced us to what GAMILLSCHEG (pp. 24 ff.) calls "assoziative Verdichtung" (I will not discuss here the applicability of the word 'Verdichtung', concentration). He gives a number of illuminating examples from French, as *banquet*, originally 'little seat', e. g., *faire le repas sur le banquet*, from which arose *faire le banquet* 'to partake of a meal', then with further specialization *banquet* came to mean 'a large or elaborate meal', 'a feast'. But from the basic *banka* 'bench', by a different specialization, was derived It. *banca*, Fr. *banque* 'bank', properly 'counter', 'money-changer's table'. An other interesting example is Fr. *toilette*, originally 'small linen cloth' (MEYER-LÜBKE REW 8620), later applied to the cloth spread upon a lady's toilet table, from which, via such phrases as *être à sa toilette*, the word acquired its modern meaning,² abstract as well as concrete.

Examples like these, which belong to the commune bonum of linguistics, might be multiplied ad libitum, and we can appreciate in this connexion the force of DARMESTER's words: "Dans aucune des langues dont nous pouvons étudier l'histoire, il n'y a de mot abstrait qui, si l'on en connaît l'étymologie, ne se résolve en mot concret." Yet it has been proved by several modern scholars that this position cannot wholly be sustained. Particularly where substantives are concerned, transitions from abstract to concrete meaning are very frequent; but to some extent this may be said to result from a secondary process,³ or to belong to professional or technical language. An example is *metus* "in sermone venatorio i. q. linea vel restis variis pennis instructa, qua

¹ On German *rot* see K. O. ERDMANN, *Die Bedeutung des Wortes* (4. Aufl., 1925), p. 30.

² Cf. GAMILLSCHEG o. c. pp. 190 f. and MEYER-LÜBKE REW 1398 on *bureau*, derived from a word meaning 'thick woollen cloth', and therefore strictly meaning 'woollen cover', 'table-cloth'; later a table covered with such a cloth; "daher heute noch *bureau* 'Zahl-tisch auf dem die Münzen aufgeworfen wurden, um ihre Echtheit zu überprüfen', aber auch 'Schreibtisch' und endlich auch 'Schreibstube' mit verschiedenen spezialisierten Meinungen."

³ This is why the phenomenon is particularly common in Late Latin and in the transition to the Romance languages: from Latin *prehensio* come It. *prigione*, Sp. *prisión*, Fr. *prison*, etc. Such cases are common.

terrent et includunt venatores feras" (Thes. L. Lat. s. v.). This is clearly a technical term of hunting: its development may be seen in Grattius 85; 88; Nemesiani Cyneg. 311; its secondary character is obvious. I shall mention a few further examples which are of interest from the standpoint of Late Latin, or sometimes of the Romance languages.

A well known group of abstract substantives of the fourth declension¹ includes *piscatus* 'fishing', 'fishery', but soon also the collective plural 'fish'; *venatus* 'hunting', but later also 'flesh of wild beasts', 'game', e. g., *venatu* or *venatibus vesci* (Plin., Amm. Marc.). This secondary use was fully alive in popular language, as the Romance derivatives show us: Sp. *pescado*, *venado*, and corresponding words in other languages, e. g., Port. *veado* 'deer', etc., MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 9189. The other abstract *venatio* acquires a concrete meaning at a relatively early date (Livy, Celsus), being used in the meaning of 'venison'. For its use in Late Latin see RÖNSCH, p. 327; Peregr. Aeth., p. 111, where I have quoted among other examples Schol. Pith. Juv. I 135 *venationum diversa genera et piscium*. For Medieval Latin cf., e. g., Chronicon Salern., p. 492,4. We may notice that the use is found also in the Romance languages, as Fr. *venaison*, Prov. *venaizó*, etc. (REW 9187).

A familiar example of development from abstract to concrete is that of *mansio* which comes to mean 'lodging', 'house', French *maison* (in other Romance languages the meaning becomes more specialized: 'lodging-house', 'stable', etc.). Less known is Late Latin *dormitio* 'bed', 'bedchamber'. The earliest example is Tert. De anima 55,4 *in aethere dormitio nostra cum puerariis Platonis aut in aere cum Ario . . .* ('resting-place', WASZINK). In Christian inscriptions *dormitio* often means 'grave' (Thes. L. Lat. V:1,2034,65 ff.); cf. Isidore, Origines I 39,20 *epitaphium . . . est titulus mortuorum, qui in dormitione eorum fit, qui iam defuncti sunt*. But the meaning 'bed' or 'bedding' occurs also in different contexts, as Mulom. Chir. 481 *mollibus dormitionibus eum* (sc. *iumentum*) *collocabis, sanum fiet* (Vegetius II 69,2 *molli dormitione*). A striking parallel is offered by *quies*. This is sometimes used to mean 'grave',² cf. DESSAU 7961 *quies Claudiae Priscae*,

¹ Cf. C. COLLIN, ALL XIII, pp. 458 ff.; BENVENISTE (cf. above p. 142, note), pp. 96 ff.; some rare examples from a later period in LÖFSTEDT, Verm. Stud., pp. 127 f.; BAXTER, ALMA XXI (1951), pp. 14 ff.

² On other originally abstract substantives which can have the same meaning see Peregr. Aeth., p. 113. For *exitus* meaning 'grave', 'graveyard' cf. CIL VIII 1213 *L. Atius Rufinus exitum fecit socre suae*; likewise *manes*, l.c. note 2. To these expressions we

but may also signify 'lair' (originally a technical term of hunting?) as Lucr. I 405 *canes . . . ferarum / naribus inveniunt intectas fronde quietes* (ἄπαξ λεγόμενον in this sense).

Another interesting use is that of *oratio* in Christian language to mean 'place for prayer', 'oratory', 'chapel', 'locus, aedes, ubi oratur'. On this usage see RÖNSCH, Sem. Beitr. I, p. 52; Peregr. Aeth. pp. 110 f.; SVENNUNG, Untersuch., p. 521. There is no doubt some influence of Greek προσευχή 'oratory', 'chapel',¹ at least in the earliest examples: cf. Vulg.,² Act. Apost. 16,13: *egressi sumus foras portam iuxta flumen, ubi videbatur oratio* (προσευχή) *esse*; 16,16 *euntibus nobis ad orationem* (εἰς τὴν προσευχήν). Among other examples we may mention Sulp. Sev. Chron. II 41,5 (p. 95,4 HALM) *ecclesiam nostri optinent, Arriani autem aedem tum . . . vacantem orationis loco capiunt*. The usage flourishes also in the Middle Ages, cf. DU CANGE s. v. In Biblical Latin, as we have seen, Greek influence is obvious, but the development is in any case natural enough in itself: cf. Fr. *prêche* 'sermon' (esp. a Protestant sermon), but later also "lieu où s'assemblent les protestants pour l'exercice de leur religion" (LITTRÉ).

A very striking and interesting expression is the concrete use of *labor*, which I have dealt with in detail in Eranos XLIV, pp. 347 ff. The first stage was the specialization of the word to mean 'labour in the fields', which to the common people was labour par excellence.³ In this sense we find it used in Antonius Placentinus' Itinerarium, rec. A, c. 40 (he is speaking of a certain Arabian tribe): *nullum laborem habentes, quia nec habent ubi*,⁴ *eo quod totum harena sit*. A further stage on its semantic journey is recorded in Greg. Magn., Dial. I 3 (A.D. 593), p. 26,15 MORICCA: *quare in labore monachorum furtum totiens facere praesumpsisti?* Here it is obvious that *labor* is used in

may add *obitus*, cf. CIL VIII 21539 *Iulius . . . recessit in pace . . . cui fratres obitum fecerunt*; 21540 *cui filios et nepotes obitum fecerunt*. On the other hand *mors* comes by metonymy to signify 'dead man', 'corpse'. Cf. GEORGES s. v.; ROTHSTEIN on Prop. II 13,22; Octavia 611 in the manuscripts has *mortis metu* meaning *metu mortuae*. The expression belonged to the high style of poetry and rhetoric; for Late Latin cf. VOLLMER's Index to MGH, AA XIV, p. 437. Odd examples occur also in Medieval Latin, e. g., *Excidium Troiae*, ed. ATWOOD and WHITAKER (1944), p. 47,14.

¹ LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, and BAUER s. v.; BLASS on Act. Apost. 16,13.

² Similarly some Itala mss.; see RÖNSCH l. c.

³ The same meaning can be attached to *opus* (cf., e. g., Ter. H. T. 73); cf. the cognate OHG *uobo* 'farmer', 'farm worker' (GRAFF I, 71); MHG *uop* 'tilling', 'farm work'.

⁴ On this usage see my Coniectanea I (Uppsala-Stockholm 1950), p. 66.

the sense of *ager* or *hortus*. Similarly in the early Middle Ages, e. g., Liutprandi Leges 146,4 *ambulare per laborem alterius* (a few lines earlier in the same text we read: *per campum suum seminatum ambulantem*). Further examples of the meaning 'field', 'tilled field' are given l.c. 348. But even the still more specialized meaning 'corn' is to be found. The Lombard documents furnish a good many examples of this sense, and a few passages without comment will suffice: Cod. Dipl. Long. II, p. 119,6 (A.D. 762) enjoins somebody to deliver *vinum et laborem* *secundum consuetudinem*; for the meaning of this phrase see the regulation on p. 121,9; cf. further II, p. 261,19 (A.D. 768) *usque in portum illum, ubi est consuetudo venire laborem et salem de ipsa casa*; for further material¹ see l.c. 349. These various semantic shifts must have been deeply rooted in the living vernacular, as is shown by the Romance derivatives. Ample material is given by MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 4809; here a few examples will be enough: Logudor. *laore*, Campid. *lori* 'seed', 'corn-field'; Calabr. *laurre*, Sicil. *lauri* 'growing corn', 'corn-field'; Span. *labor*, Port. *lavor* 'labour in the field'. From *laborare* is derived, e. g., Prov. *lavorar*, *labrar* 'to plough'; cf. in Modern French (esp. dialect) *labour* 'ploughing'.

A rather complicated problem, and one which involves various factors germane to our present research, is posed by French *console* and its cognates in other languages, It. *consolle*, Span. *consola*, Eng. *console*, etc. In my Peregr. Aeth., pp. 113 f. I remarked that the words *consolari*, *consolatio* and *solacium* underwent a singular semantic change in Late Latin, coming to mean 'help', 'support'. Among the examples that I cited are Amm. Marc. XVI 7,10 *virginem omni remediorum solacio plene curatam patri tutissime servans*; Ennod. Epist. I 9 *Antaeum fabella . . . matris solacium, postquam coepit non cadere, loquitur perdidisse*; id. Vita Epiph. p. 364,1 HARTEL *solaciorum* (here = *copiarum*, *exercituum*) *tuorum pondus*. The substantive *consolatio* has the same meaning, e. g., in Benedicti Regula monachorum 1 *sine consolatione alterius sola manu vel brachio . . . pugnare*;² another example, where unnecessary attempts at emendation have been made, is given Peregr. Aeth. 114. I append some further examples to illustrate the extent of the usage. In ACO 1:4, p. 200,28 we read: *uteris eorum* (sc. *devotissimorum militum*) *solacio*; ibid. 200,31 *cum sufficienti solacio continuo veniemus* (i. e. *auxilio*, says an old commentator in MIGNE). Particular interest attaches to those passages where

¹ Examples could easily be multiplied. The meaning 'field', 'tilled field' occurs, e. g., in Chron. Vulturn., Fonti LIX, p. 198,12 (A.D. 978) *arare, seminare et labores ipsos cultare*; cf. also ibid., p. 72,17 (A.D. 950).

² Cf. LINDERBAUER's commentary, p. 152.

a Greek original is to hand, as Justinian, Novels 73,1 *ut non in sola scriptura et eius examinatione pendeamus, sed sit iudicantibus etiam testium solacium* (in the Greek text ἡ παρὰ τῶν μαρτύρων βοήθεια); ibid. 74,2 *ita brevi solacio* (συμπαρίᾳ) *tantum naturae impetum corrigentes*.¹

The development from the original meaning to the meaning 'help', 'support' is thus abundantly established, and I therefore proposed to derive Fr. *console* from *consolari* and its cognates. This idea was taken up by SPITZER² and LERCH; the latter particularly, in his paper 'Die Konsole und das Christentum' (Archivum Romanicum XXIV, 1940), made the connexion clear in all essentials; cf. also VON WARTBURG in FEW s. v. *consolari*. In the Romance languages the word only exists as a borrowing from Ecclesiastical Latin. In the sixteenth century we find the word *consolateur* in the sense of 'console', purely because the function of a console is to support; thus *consolateur* had a concrete significance and implied a supporting figure or object, an ornamental bracket.³ An interesting parallel is afforded by Church Latin *misericordiae* "sellulae erectis formarum subselliis appositae, quibus stantibus senibus vel infirmis per misericordiam insidere conceditur, dum alii stant" (DU CANGE; attested from the eleventh century on).⁴ At the present day Fr. *miséricorde* means among other things a sort of support under a choir-stall;⁵ on *Miserikordien* in German ecclesiastical usage see LERCH, p. 170. An even better parallel is provided by *consolationes* which according to LINDERBAUER signified in the Latin of monks the arm-rests fitted to choir-stalls; but he does not quote any convincing example. Nevertheless, the internal probability is very high: a similar usage is indicated by a gloss *gestamen* : *consolatio* (CGL IV 588,28; V 502,29), which has hitherto caused puzzlement. Other instructive examples of a transition from abstract to concrete, particularly in religious language, are given by LERCH, pp. 172 ff. Shortly after *consolateur*, *console* makes its appearance;⁶

¹ On *solacium* = *auxilium* see also RÖNSCH, Sem. Beitr. I, p. 66 (Rufinus); KRUSCH's Index to Gregory of Tours, and TRAUBE's Index to the Variae of Cassiodorus; in Medieval Latin. e. g., De imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma libellus (Fonti LV), p. 200, 17 f. (saec. X). For *consolatio* in a rather different sense Vitae Patrum VI 3,15.

² Zeitschr. f. französ. Sprache u. Lit. XLIV, pp. 246 ff.

³ LERCH: 'Tragsteine'; VON WARTBURG: 'geschnitzte, menschen darstellende figuren' (see the bibliography that he gives).

⁴ Adduced by SVENNUNG, Oros., p. 109.

⁵ See LITTRÉ s. v. *miséricorde*, 7.

⁶ Cf. in this connexion *disciplina* 'means of enforcing discipline', 'rod'; *ascensus* 'carriage'; *ebrietas* 'strong drink'; *dispersio* 'the Jews of the Dispersion'; further material in KAULEN, pp. 34 ff.; HOPPE, pp. 91 ff.; GOELZER, pp. 394 f.

VON WARTBURG considers it to be simply a shortened form of *consolateur*, or perhaps to have been re-formed under its influence from the verb *consoler*.

The French *potence* 'crutch', allows of a simpler explanation. The account of its development given by GAMILLSCHEG (Et. Wb. s.v.) seems to me far too involved. He sees in *potence* an 'Umdeutung' of *potentia* 'might, power', after O. Fr. *post* 'door-post', or a conflation of *étance* with this same *post*, "so dass mittellat. *potentia* 'Galgen' erst literarische Umdeutung eines afrz. **postance* ist." I can find nothing convincing in this hypothesis: *potentia* meaning 'crutch' is common enough in Medieval Latin, and is simply another case of development from abstract to concrete; cf. Nova miracula beate Radegundis 6 (saec. XIII; Anal. Boll. XXIII, p. 441,8) *qui cum Rosiacum . . . duabus potentiis sustentans vix venisset, inde unico baculo in crastino contentus ad sepulchrum felicissime regine venit*; ibid. 12 (p. 444,22) *mane facto iter arripiunt, mulier tamen duabus potentiis sustentata et in prima dieta¹ aliquantulum gravata*; ibid. (p. 444,26) *sine potentiis et baculo*.² The semantic development is perfectly analogous with those considered above, and is no doubt older than the examples which attest it.

A number of examples of this development belong peculiarly to the language of religion, which commonly deals in metaphor and symbol, and in which the interplay between the literal and the allegorical, the corporeal and the spiritual has important consequences. But the examples which we have already seen show that it is not confined to this sphere. A few typical examples may be appended. On the one hand we often find in ecclesiastical writers the words *virtus* (often corresponding to a Greek *δύναμις*) meaning 'miracle', 'object with miraculous powers'; SPITZER (l. c., p. 248) rightly compares O. Prov. *vertut* 'relic', and O. Fr. *vertu* 'sovereign remedy'. Both these meanings are found fully developed in Late Latin; for the former see Peregr. Aeth., p. 112, for the latter SVENNUNG, Wortstudien s. v.³ On the other hand we find *virtus* in military language meaning 'military force', 'army' (as also Greek

¹ *Dieta* 'day's journey' (Coniectanea I, p. 131).

² Other examples in DU CANGE, including the following from Miracula S. Lifardi: *S. Lifardum viderunt assistere tenentem baculum in manu dextera, qui vulgari vocabulo nuncupari potentia consuevit*.

³ E. g. Theod. Prisc. II 44 (p. 144,15 ROSE) *emplastra vel antidota vel cetera quae ex variis virtutibus componuntur*.

δύναμις); cf. KAULEN, p. 33; Peregr. Aeth. l. c.;¹ but it is uncertain how far this is reflected by O. Sp. *virtos* 'army' (CORNU, Romania X, p. 81). From more homely surroundings we have the concrete use of *dignitas*; it appears in several Romance languages (MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 2640): O. Lomb. *dignitade* 'elaborate dish'; O. Fr. *deintie* 'delicacy' (from this is derived the Eng. *dainty*); Mod. Fr. *daintiers* 'a particularly succulent cut of venison'; Prov. *denhtat* 'delicacy' (details in DIEZ, Et. Wb., pp. 558 f.). The basic meaning seems to have been 'finesse', 'nicety'.

A few words should here be added about a special class of abstracts, which in Late Latin take on not only a concrete, but a personal and individual meaning — a phenomenon which is particularly common in words denoting office or rank. The same tendency can sometimes be detected in late Greek and Byzantine documents,² although not so frequently as in Latin, so far as my knowledge goes. But the question is one which deserves a closer study, and it is possible that a different picture would emerge. This much however is certain, that the two languages not seldom exercised mutual influence where this construction is concerned.³ Several examples of it have been examined in my Verm. Stud., pp. 211 ff., but since the development is one of considerable importance for the history of Late Latin, some of them may fitly be cited again here. Some new examples will also be added; for the problem in general see the place referred to and Peregr. Aeth., pp. 111 ff.⁴

A typical example is the often quoted *testimonium* for *testis*; cf. Fr. *témoïn*. The usage is already established in Late Latin, and its development can be followed stage by stage. The starting-point is seen in expressions like the

¹ Similarly in Medieval Latin. Thus in Anastasius' translation of the Chronicon of Theophanes Confessor, p. 157,32 (DE BOOR): *multos virtutis eius extinxit* (in the Greek text τῆς ... δυνάμεως); p. 158,22 *sumptis virtutibus Apiriam civitatem obsedit* (ἀναλαβὼν τὰς δυνάμεις); similar examples are frequent, cf. Du CANGE s. v.

² An example which seems to have escaped the notice of lexicographers is *πρωτεῖον*, normally 'chief rank', 'first place', etc. It is used in a concrete and personal sense, e. g., in the Chronicon of Theophanes Confessor (saec. IX in., p. 293,15 (DE BOOR): τὰ δὲ πρωτεῖα τοῦ δήμου οὐ κατεδέξαντο τοῦτο, which Anastasius in this translation (latter half of the same century) renders correctly as *primores cuius*.

³ Cf. ZILLIACUS, Weltsprachen, pp. 171 ff. et passim; above pp. 110 ff.

⁴ There are a great many marginal cases, which arise from the incidental metonymies of rhetoric or poetry: *dominatio* = *dominus* (Dracont. Romul. V 207 *Caesar, dominatio prima senatus* etc.); *triumphi* = *victi*, *amicitiae* = *amici*, etc. The meaning in these cases seems to hover between concrete and abstract (this applies in my opinion to, e. g., *amicitias* in Tac. Ann. IV 40).

following of Sulp. Sev., Vita Mart. 7,5 *ita redditus vitae ... plures postea vixit annos, primusque apud nos Martini virtutum vel materia vel testimonium fuit* (the conjoining of *materia* is noteworthy). But in Lex Salica 56,1 m. the meaning is purely personal: *tria testimonia iurare debent*; cf. also Peregr. Aeth. 45,4 *nisi testimonia habuerit, qui eum noverint, non tam facile accedet ad baptismum* (notice the gender of the relative pronoun); other examples Verm. Stud., pp. 212 f., to which add ACO II:3, p. 474,6 *coram testimoniis ... nullus ex omnibus est qui vel doceat vel moneat*, where the Greek text has ἐπὶ μαρτύρων. From the early Middle Ages cf. Liutpr. leg. 79 (A.D. 726); also Cod. Dipl. Long. II, p. 448,23 (A.D. 786) *testimonia, qui cartula(m) ipsa(m) vidissent*; p. 449,9 *testimonia ipsa et ipsum notarium*; p. 449,16, et saepius.¹ A striking parallel is offered by Eng. *witness*; the development according to MURRAY, NED s. v. is the following: knowledge, understanding; attestation of a fact; testimony; one who gives evidence. The same happens in the case of Swedish *vittne*, earlier *vitne* (originally 'proof', 'attestation'), and of Danish *vidne*, DAHLERUP l. c. 80. In this case the development seems to be inherent in the very nature of the matter.

In Medieval Latin — not earlier, so far as my knowledge goes — we even find *iustitia* meaning *iudex*,² it occurs several times in the *Disciplina clericalis* of Petrus Alfonsi (saec. XII in.), as p. 25,25 ff. (ed. HILKA-SÖDERHJELM): *Quem postquam vidit iusticia, ut sapientem et philosophum vocavit vocatumque iuxta se sedere fecit. Inde iusticia vocavit accusantem et accusatum ... Illis vero sic coram astantibus iusticia ait philosopho quod causas eorum audiret et inde iudicium faceret*. Cf. English *justice* in the same sense (simply taken over from law Latin); Sp. *justicia* 'court of justice', 'police', etc. Essentially the same, but much older, is the use of *custodia* in the concrete sense 'prisoner', *captivus*. It first occurs in Seneca, e. g., Ep. 5,7 *eadem catena et custodiam et militem copulat*; similarly Pliny and others, also Biblical Latin, e. g., Vulg., Act. Ap. 27,1 *tradi Paulum cum reliquis custodiis centurioni* (but the Greek text has δεσμώτας); ibid. 27,42 *militum autem consilium fuit, ut custodias (τοὺς δεσμώτας) occiderent*; other examples in Thes. L. Lat. IV 1558 f. (Digest, etc.). The usage seems to have been rather

¹ SPITZER, Vox Rom. IV, 135 rightly observes: "Das fr. *témoin* wird meist falsch erklärt (aus *testimonio* esse oder *testimonio Ciceronis*)." Even MEYER-LÜBKE III § 127 gives a circuitous explanation via Old French; but the personal application is found, as we have seen, fully developed in Late Latin.

² Attested by BAXTER-JOHNSON s. v. from c. 1072 to c. 1370.

colloquial, since Servius (ad Aen. XI 184) says: *male est in usu 'custodiae audiuntur'*.

It is well known that *mancipium* and *servitium*, from being originally abstract, at an early time came to signify the concrete notion 'slave' or 'slaves' collectively; similar is the development of *ministerium* and *officium* in Late Latin, which both come to mean 'servant', in official as well as colloquial style. The first indications of *ministerium* in this sense occur in Tacitus and his contemporaries; cf. Verm. Stud. pp. 213 f. The development appears at its clearest in such passages as Rufin. Hist. Mon. 29 (MIGNE, PL 21,455 B) *equos plurimos ac pueros et multa secum ministeria habentes*; Aug. De vera religione 55,110 *hoc etiam ipsos optimos angelos et excellentissima Dei ministeria velle credamus*. For less cultivated language, cf., e. g., BÜCHELER, CE 1788 *cum ministeria tria, Fortunata, Augendus, Augenda*; more examples l. c. As for *officium*, it is common knowledge that in late imperial times this signified 'official', 'office-holder' (GEORGES II 1331; Actus Petri cum Simone 23). It is worthy of notice that in the Novels of Justinian the word often corresponds to Greek *τάξις*, which, though usually ignored, is used in the same meaning; cf. 128,16 (p. 642,14 SCHÖLL-KROLL) *provinciarum iudices aut eorum officia* (*ἢ τὰς τούτων τάξεις*) *aut alium quemlibet*; 128,22 (p. 645,8); 8,7 (p. 70,31) *et passim*. From this starting-point the usage becomes as free as in the following example: Descensio Christi, rec. A, 5,1 *dixit inferus ad sua impia officia* (*τοῖς δαίμοσιν αὐτοῦ*): 'claudite portas'; in the singular, e. g., Passio s. oliecti et al., c. 2 (Anal. Boll. XXVIII, p. 465,16) *Maximus dux ad officium dixit: 'vetustissimi isti homines unde sunt?' Officium respondit: 'Christiani sunt.'*

On *dignitas* signifying the holder of a high rank or office, see Thes. V:1, 1139,12 ff. Sometimes Greek influence may be perceived, as Passio Petri et Pauli long. 51 (p. 163,10 LIPSIUS) *Nero praecepit . . . ut omnes populi et omnes dignitates* (*ἀξιώματα*) *ad istud spectaculum convenirent*.

The use of *obsequium* to mean 'train', 'retinue', *comitatus* has received little notice. The earliest example hitherto observed seems to be Apul. Met. IV 31 *non moratur marinum obsequium: adsunt Nerei filiae . . . et Portunus . . . et gravis piscoso sinu Salacia . . .* The more usual and natural usage is found, e. g., in Amm. Marc. XXX 1,22 *scripserit ad regem, ut a citeriore caveret obsequio*; Coripp. In laud. Iust. I 188 *itur in arcem obsequio comitante patrum*; Liber Pontificalis (ed. MOMMSEN), p. 194,15 *ut etiam de palatio caballos stratos dirigeret cum obsequio*. The plural is also found: Greg. Magn. Dial.

II 14 (p. 101,15 MORICCA) *cui alia quoque obsequia atque spatarios praebuit* (a little lower down *obsequenium frequentia comitatus*). For the *Vitae Patrum* cf. SALONIUS, p. 417; for Cassiodorus TRAUBE's index to the *Variae* (he explains the word as 'comitatus regius', 'officiales'); for Medieval Latin, e. g., *Passio Fabii vexilliferi* 4 (Anal. Boll. IX, p. 127,4) *ab obsequio pedem retraxit* (just above, p. 126,30 *obsecundantium longa deductio*). In Anastasius' translation of Theophanes Confessor, p. 202,25 DE BOOR, we find: *movit ergo Chosrohes homines principum suorum et omne obsequium suum atque mulierum suarum*; here the Greek original has τὴν ὑπουργίαν, which is itself an example of development from abstract to concrete.¹

Even so common and important a word as *potestas* acquires concrete and personal signification, meaning not only 'authority', but also 'one who has authority'. Thus an early and vulgar ms. of the Book of Baruch, the codex Cavensis, reads 1,9 *potestates et populum terrae* (LXX δυνατοῦς, Vulg. *potentes*); likewise Mirac. Steph. II 5,1 *exurgit in voce terribili potestas irata* (referring to a proconsul). Sometimes *potestas* in this sense may be associated with a pronoun in the masculine, by a sort of sense-construction,² e. g., Cod. Theodos. III, 11,1 (p. 150,3 MOMMSEN-MEYER) *ad magnificam potestatem, qui* (earlier editors *quae*) *principis auribus hoc possit intimare, recurrat*; similarly Pass. Polycarpi 10,2 *potestatibus, qui Deo ordinante procedunt, morem gerere*. From this construction it is but a short step to the Italian *il podestà* (a sort of mayor or burgomaster). For further material see my Verm. Studien, p. 215, where it is noted that *potestas* in this sense often represents Greek ἐξουσία,³ e. g., Hermae Pastor, versio vulg., sim. 9,28 (p. 152,10 HILGENFELD) *quicumque perducti ad potestates interrogati non negaverunt* (ἐξουσίαν; versio Pal., p. 253,2 *potestatem*); Vulg., Luc. 12,11 *inducunt vos in synagogas et ad magistratus et potestates* (ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας). The first beginnings of this construction can be traced at an early date: WACKERNAGEL II 23 observes that Virgil not only apostrophizes Jupiter as *pater omnipotens, rerum cui prima potestas* (Aen. X 100), but makes Venus address him with the words *o pater, o hominum rerumque aeterna potestas* (Aen. X 18). Here we have a more or less accidental instance of metonymy, but in Late Latin the usage becomes fairly common.

¹ This use of ὑπουργία is apparently unknown even to PREISIGKE, BAUER, and SOPHOCLES.

² Cf. above p. 152: *testimonia, qui* . . .

³ On the use of this word in later Greek see the dictionaries of BAUER and PREISIGKE.

Some examples of *imperium* and *regnum* meaning *imperator* and *rex* respectively have already been given in Peregr. Aeth., p. 112, but the phenomenon perhaps deserves a little more attention. Here again it seems to me that the starting-point is in the language of poetry and rhetoric. In the Panegyrici (ed. BAEHRENS, 1911), p. 220,21 the manuscripts read: *quae sunt huius propria laetitiae, qua tibi Caesari additum nomen imperii*. Some earlier editors conjectured *imperatoris*, in which they were certainly wrong; cf. on the one hand Amm. Marc. XXIX 1,32 *quaerentibus nobis, qui praesenti succedet imperio*; on the other Panegyri., p. 99,32 *periculo non minore quam scelere ... regni nomen emistis*. Particularly significant is the use of *regnum*, where we should expect *rex*. For poetical style cf. Stat. Theb. XII 380 *etsi regna vetant* (although here 'the governments' might be meant); Dracont. Romul. VIII 288 *conubium regni ... scindere poscebant* (cf. 306 *conubium rescinde tuum*); VOLLMER's Index p. 402. In the old Latin version of the Epistle of Barnabas c. 4,4 we read: *dicit autem sic propheta: regna in terris decem regnabunt*. The Greek text has βασιλείαι δέκα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς βασιλεύσουσιν; but in the passage alluded to, Dan. 7,24, the Vulgate has *decem reges erunt* (δέκα βασιλεῖς). The alternative title for the Book of Kings, *Liber Regnorum*, can also be referred to the Greek original: Βασιλείων α', etc.

But the most surprising of the concrete meanings of *regnum* is still to be mentioned. Both in the early and the late Middle Ages we find the word used to signify 'crown', especially referring to the temporal power of the papacy, but sometimes in other contexts also; cf. Liber pontificalis, ed. MOMMSEN, p. 178,12 *quia sibi regnum imponere voluisset*; p. 224,8 *Augustus christianissimus cum regno in capite sese prostravit et pedes osculans pontificis ...*; ibid. 130,21 (P); 131,1. It is interesting to find *regnum* = *corona* in a sermon ascribed by MORIN to Augustine; the usage in fact argues strongly against so early a dating.¹ Examples from the later Middle Ages are given by DU CANGE, who even finds testimony of the "tiara triplici corona ornata, quod regnum appellatur." The development is, after all, not so very hard to understand: in such phrases as *regnum arripere*, etc. the concrete and the abstract use amount to the same thing.

The use of *hereditas* to mean *heredes*, *posteritas* is attested in Thes. L. Lat. VI:3,

¹ See CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin I, pp. 56 f. She concludes on other grounds as well that the work was written perhaps at a rather late period in imitation of Augustine's style. This is very likely the right opinion.

2642,17 ff. by a number of examples, of which the earliest is Tac. Hist. I 16; on this interpretation and similar cases see HILDEGARD KORNHARDT in Philologus XCV, pp. 287 ff.; 297. Other and more certain examples occur later, especially in Church Latin. Among these is Vulg. Sirach 23,32 *mulier ... relinquens virum suum et statuens hereditatem ex alieno matrimonio* (the Greek text has the personal *κληρονόμος*); cf. 23,33 *et ex alio viro filios statuit sibi*. Similarly, e. g., Augustine in Psalm. 88 serm. 1, 29 (MIGNE, PL 37, 1130) *semen eius, quae est hereditas eius*. The examples do not appear to have any colloquial colouring, but it seems likely that the usage to a certain extent belonged to the living language. To the material given in Thes. L. Lat. and Philologus may be added by way of confirmation the Old Venetian *rità* 'descendant', which PIO RAJNA¹ explained as a derivative of *hereditatem*; the etymology has since been accepted by SPITZER.²

As we have already seen, many of these semantic changes belong to the language of religion. Another important group pertains to the language of law and administration: *custodia*, *iustitia*, *ministerium*, *officium*, *obsequium*, *potestas*, etc. Here we have a reflection in the world of language of the complex bureaucratic system which characterized the late Roman empire. The same applies, mutatis mutandis, to Late and Byzantine Greek.³ In both cases the development which we have traced⁴ has been put in train by the conjoint forces of the church, the law, and the civil service.

Some other changes of meaning which are highly characteristic of Late Latin are of a quite different kind, and must be given a separate treatment. When we find a good many words, well known or seemingly well known from earlier periods, occurring in new and surprising meanings, this may be due to

¹ Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, 1891, pp. 335 ff.

² Zeitschr. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit. XLIV, p. 248. Cf. also BRÉAL, Essai de sémantique, p. 153.

³ Similarly in other languages. Cf., e. g., Germ. *Rat*, which according to GRIMM, D. Wörterbuch VIII 169 ff., from its original abstract function is first extended to a collective and local signification: "gesamtzahl derer die beratung pflegen und ort einer solchen beratung, ratsversammlung"; next "amtliche bezeichnung einer das gemeine wol beratenden behörde, concilium"; finally "diejenige person, die da rat erteilt". From this come all the concrete and personal derivatives: *Herr Hofrat* (*Kanzleirat*, *Regierungsrat*, etc.); *Goethes Mutter*, *die Frau Rat*, etc. The Scandinavian languages also exhibit substantially the same development from the notion of a council to the title accorded to those taking part therein; see HELLQVIST, Svensk etymologisk ordbok, s. v. *råd*; DAHLERUP, l. c., p. 80.

⁴ Cf. above pp. 108 ff.

widely differing circumstances. In some cases the change is a natural and organic one; a word which is formally similar to another and cognate with it, may have its meaning modified and made closer to that of the other. In other cases it may be more reasonable to postulate a sort of etymologizing new formation, perhaps learned, perhaps popular in origin, or else a pure blunder arising from ignorance: in the Middle Ages it is not always easy to decide which. A few examples will illustrate the diverse character of these two categories, which often cannot be clearly distinguished.¹

To the first group we may assign *mendum* in the sense of *mendacium* (and *mendosus* = *mendax*).² Charisius (p. 72,28 KEIL) expressly attests *mendum* in *mendacii significatione*, and in certain cases the difference between the two is not very great. In this connexion cf. Mulom. Chir. 120 (p. 39,2) *hi omnes mendum adferent* (in the Greek original οὐκ ἀληθεύουσιν οὗτοι); Greg. Turon. Hist. Franc. VI 40 (p. 279,6 ARNDT) *mendum esse, quod dixerat se esse catholicum*. Other examples are more remarkable, and in many cases have been emended by editors. A similar case is that of *periculum* meaning 'death' by psychological and semasiological association with *perire*.³ Here again the semantic development is an easy one. For instance, Arnobius I 3 (p. 6,28 REIFFERSCHIED) has: *terrarum validissimis motibus tremefactae nutant usque ad periculum civitates*; Vulg., II Cor. 1,10 *qui de tantis periculis nos eripuit* (the Greek text has ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου ἐρύσατο ἡμᾶς).⁴ The usage gradually becomes freer and more common, and is even extended — a fact hitherto unnoticed — to the verb *periclitari*; cf. Inventio reliquiarum S. Eligii 13 (Anal. Boll. IX 436,2; saec. XII) *cum osse, quo vexatus et paene periclitatus fuerat*.⁵

¹ On the phenomenon in general see LÖFSTEDT, *Verm. Stud.* pp. 93 ff.; *Eranos* XLIV (1946), pp. 340 ff.; BLATT in *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* XXVIII (1933), pp. 44 f.; Fra Cicero til Copernicus (1940), pp. 101 ff.; NORBERG, *ALMA* XXII (1952), pp. 5 ff.

² Details in *Verm. Stud.* pp. 93 f.

³ Cf. LÖFSTEDT, *Arnob.*, pp. 38 f.; LINDERBAUER's commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict, p. 178; BERGMANN's Index to Prudentius, p. 547; BLOMGREN, *Studia Fortunatiana* (Diss. Uppsala 1933), p. 148.

⁴ In my opinion this meaning occurs as early as Hyginus: cf. *Fab.* 8 (p. 10 ROSE) *quam pater cum punire vellet propter stuprum minitans periculum, Antiopa effugit*. At all events the usual meaning is impossible here.

⁵ BAXTER-JOHNSON cite *periclitatio* meaning 'shipwreck' (A.D. 1342) and *periclitor* meaning 'to suffer shipwreck' (1337). We can add a passage from *Vita et mirac. s. Petri Caelestini* 41 (Anal. Boll. IX p. 178,15) *in tantum mare turbatum est, quod (= ut) paulo minus (= paene) illa navis parata ad illum recipiendum periclitaret*.

Another fairly easy semantic development is that of *damnare* = *damno afficere*; on this usage cf. Thes. L. Lat. V 19,75 ff.; Verm. Stud., p. 96; ARNALDI s. v.; Regula ad virgines 10 (MIGNE, PL 88,1062 C) *corpora necessario cibo reficiantur, non nimia saturitate damnentur*; Mirac. (Transl.) s. Eugenii 8 (Anal. Boll. III, p. 62,1) *habens filium caecum et filiam nervorum contractione damnatam*. It is noteworthy that *damnare* 'hurt' has derivatives in O. French and other Romance languages; see VON WARTBURG, FEW s. v.; MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 2467; PIRSON in 'Mélanges Wilmotte' (1910), p. 519.

A different class is represented by *mentio* meaning *mendacium*; this is a new formation based upon *mentiri*, and its raison d'être is more formal than semantic. We find this strange *mentio*, e. g., in Venant. Fort., Vita Hilarii 8,26 *composita mentione aliud ex alio referens fraus haeretica serpentino lapsu subripuit*¹ (the Maurini read *mentitione*); Regula Magistri 15 (MIGNE, PL 88,982 B) *si mentionem suadet frequenter, legatur illi ... ubi praecipit veritatem*; CGL II 128,54 *mentio: ἀνάμνησις καὶ ψεῦσμα*. Further material on *mentio* (and on its derivatives *mentiosus* and *mentionarius*) are given in Verm. Stud., p. 94. It is interesting to note that *mentio* 'untruth' and *mentionarius* 'liar' both have Romance derivatives (see MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 5508),² so that they cannot have been purely fortuitous formations.

Very common in Late and Medieval Latin is the use of *morosus* to mean *tardus*, arising from a false notion that it was derived from *mora*. Cf. Regula ad virgines 8 (MIGNE, PL 88,1060 D) *si morose et segniter veniat post primi psalmi ... finem*. We find this usage as early as Terentianus Maurus (v. 319; 2819) and Arnobius III 10 *intestini ponderis morositate cunctari*; it also occurs in various Late Latin writers, as Cassianus, Symmachus, etc., and throughout the Middle Ages down to the Renaissance.³ Nevertheless, it seems to have left no traces in the Romance tongues.

For the interpretation of historical documents of the Middle Ages it is necessary to bear in mind that apart from the old meaning of *irritare* 'to

¹ On Late Latin *subripio* for *subrepto* see SALONIUS, pp. 429 f.; NORBERG, Greg. Magn. I, pp. 45 f. (numerous references); HELM's Index to Fulgentius. Also in medieval texts, e. g., Anal. Boll. VIII, p. 56,8; 56,23.

² In the cases of It. *menzogna* and O. Fr. *mensogne* (mod. Fr. *mensonge*) and other cognates it is necessary to postulate a derivation from *mentio* = *mendacium* (cf. REW 5509).

³ A large number of examples and references are given in Eranos XLIV, p. 341. This *morosus* has nothing at all to do with the classical *mōrosus*; the first syllable is shown to be short by the examples from Terentianus Maurus.

irritate', 'annoy', 'provoke' (pres. *irrīlo*), there is a new meaning given by derivation from *irritus*, namely 'to render ineffective', *irritum facere*. This usage may seem somewhat surprising; but what is more surprising is that it occurs in the oldest Latin versions of the Bible. RÖNSCH¹ was the first to give examples of it from the Itala, e. g., Cod. Sangall., Matth. 15,6 *irritastis mandatum dei* (ἠκυρώσατε; Vulg. *irritum fecistis*); Marc. 7,9 *irritatis praeceptum dei* (ἀθετεῖτε; Vulg. *irritum facitis*); Cod. Boerner., Ep. ad Gal. 3,15 *confirmatum testamentum nemo irritat* (ἀθετεῖ; Vulg. *spernit*); cf. further RÖNSCH l. c. Generally speaking, the verb in this meaning is extremely rare in ancient authors; one example occurs in ACO I : 5, p. 376,8 *quae omnia, quae ... ab haereticis facta sunt, irritent* (the Greek text has ἀκυρώσει).²

But in the Merovingian period and indeed throughout the Middle Ages the usage is frequently attested. Cf. Vita Wilfridi I 41 (MGH Mer. VI, p. 234,8; between 711 and 731) *promisit ut nullus inimicorum ... pactum initum foederis secum inritaret*. Some examples from a later period are given by DU CANGE and BARTAL s. v.; cf. also BAXTER-JOHNSON: "*irritatio*, making void 1341, 1451; *irrito*, to make void, invalidate c. 1185, a(n)te 1564." Naturally this usage crops up in Scandinavian texts also, where it has not always been rightly understood.³ An Italian example is Vitae Catonis fragm. Marburg,⁴ p. IV, 14 *si tamen quis irritare vellet quidquid ab eo gestum esset, necesse fore ut etiam ea, quae ipse in Cypro fecisset, irrita haberentur*. With this passage cf. Plutarch, Cat. Min. 40 εἰ δὲ ἀναιρεῖ τις ὅσα ... ἔπραξεν, ἀναιρεῖσθαι πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν περὶ Κύπρον πραγματείαν. The meaning we have given to *irritare* is here guaranteed both by the parallel *irrita haberentur* and by the Greek ἀναιρεῖν. The Latin fragment has been assigned to Thræsea Paetus, whose biography of Cato was one of Plutarch's sources; in fact it comes from a translation of Plutarch executed by the

¹ Itala u. Vulgata, p. 165; Sem. Beitr. III, p. 54.

² For this example I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. M. SCHELLER of the Thesaurus-Bureau. He states also that the reference given in many lexica to Cod. Iust. III 12,2 (or Cod. Theod. III 12,2) is wrong. The passage intended is apparently one in the so-called Epitome Aegidii. "Es würde sich um einen Text des frühen 8. Jhdts. handeln, der nach HÄNDEL, Lex Rom. Visig. X. XXV f. ein klares, gelegentlich aber junge Elemente enthaltendes Latein zeigt."

³ Cf. Svensk tidskrift 1951, pp. 208 f. on an interesting document dating probably from 1208-1209.

⁴ Ed. by H. NISSEN, Ind. lectionum, Marburg 1875-76.

younger Lapo da Castiglionchio (ob. 1438), or rather by some other Renaissance humanist (F. Barbaro?).¹

This particular use of *irritare* flourished in written Latin for more than a thousand years, as did the use of *morosus* which we have just mentioned, but it is hard to say to what extent it belonged to the living language. Certainly it has left no trace in the Romance languages.

I shall add a few more examples of this peculiar kind of formation, which, however artificial and even shocking it may seem to a classically trained ear, can be shown from Romance derivatives to have been rooted in the spoken language. The use of *rogus* for *rogatio*, *obsecratio* has not, I think, hitherto been noticed. It is apparently a new noun-formation from the root of *rogare*. Cf. the letter of Gregory III to Charles Martel (MGH Epist. III, p. 479,1; A.D. 740) *coniuro te in Deum vivum et verum et ipsas sacratissimas claves confessionis beati Petri, quas vobis ad rogum direximus, ut non proponas ...*; similarly in a letter of Hadrian I (A.D. 788), *ibid.* p. 618,10 *per Attonem diaconem ... rogum emisimus, ut ...* The expression *per rogum* 'at the request of' occurs several times in Chron. Vulturn. (Fonti LIX), as p. 19,3 (A.D. 878) *per rogum Johannis ... concessimus ...*; p. 97,5 (A.D. 876) *per rogum nostre coniugis ... concedimus in monasterio beati Vincencii martyris Christi ecclesiam sancti Marcelli, que est constructa in loco Florine, cum servis et ancillis et omnibus suis pertinenciis*; p. 284,11 (A.D. 997) *per rogum Alberici ... scripsi ego Petrus iudex et notarius*; p. 286,14 (A.D. 984) *per rogum superscripti Mattefredi ... scripsit*; p. 342,3 (A.D. 989) *per rogum de Benedicto scripsi ego*.

In various Romance languages derivatives of this *rogus* are found, meaning 'ask', 'require': O. Fr. *ruef*, Sp. *ruego*, Port. *rogo*, etc. These words are usually explained as being derived from the respective Romance equivalents of *rogare* (thus MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 7361, if I understand him correctly). But one might well ask if there is anything to be said against the simpler derivation from the *rogus* which we have been discussing. At all events the possibility deserves more attention than it has been given.

The use of *dolus* for *dolor* is well known. It occurs often in vulgar inscriptions and texts (cf. Thes. L. Lat. V 1837), e. g., CIL III 1903 *cum dolum tantum haberent de Valerio*; Fredegarius, Chron. cont. 53 (p. 193,2) *ut dolus est ad dicendum* ('it is painful to say'). The following utterance of Augustine is very interesting:

¹ Cf. SCHANZ, *Gesch. d. röm. Litteratur* § 441,1; also F. P. LUISO, *Studi Ital. di filol. class.* VII (1899), p. 261, n. 3.

In evang. Joh. 7,18 *multi fratres imperitiores latinitatis loquuntur sic, ut dicant 'd o l u s illum torquet', pro eo quod est 'd o l o r'*. He brands those who use this form as *imperitiores*, but one of this class is Ambrose (Ep. 31,11), and the usage has prevailed in the living language; cf. Span. *duelo*, It. *duolo*, O. Fr. *duel*, Mod. Fr. *deuil*, etc. (MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 2727), which cannot be derived from *dolor*.

We are surprised to find *iterare* sometimes used not in its old sense 'to repeat', but meaning *iter facere*. This is a comparatively late formation from *iter*, belonging both to the written and the spoken language, and occurring first in Venantius Fortunatus; cf. his Vita Germ. 49,136 *per Belsam sancto iterante*; Vita Pat. 7,20 *advenienti iteranti et ipsum (sc. panem) ... largitus est*. An express testimony is CGL II 91,19 *iterat: ὁδοιπορεῖ*. Further instances are to be found in Eranos XLIV, p. 342; to which I can add, e. g., Vita s. Alexii 1 (in Miscellanea Cassinese I) *tres ... mensae parabantur in domo eius, orphanis, viduis, peregrinis et iterantibus*. This *iterare* (like the classical *iterare* 'to repeat') has left its traces in the Romance languages; cf. O. Fr. *errer* 'to travel', 'to wander' (in such phrases as *Juif errant*, *chevalier errant*, Fr.-Comté *ore* 'to walk'. According to GAMILLSCHEG, Et. Wb. s. v. *errant*, the Late Latin *iterare* = *iter facere* is only postulated, not attested, and even MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 4555, seems to assign the development of this meaning to Old French (if I understand him correctly). But this view is quite wrong: the *iterare* in Venantius and other writers was already known to DIEZ (Et. Wb., p. 573); cf. particularly PH. FUCHS in Romanische Forschungen XXXVIII, pp. 336 f.; LERCH, ibid. LIII, p. 237. The connexion between the Late Latin verb and the Romance forms is obvious, and can perhaps be traced in its details. As I have remarked elsewhere,¹ it is surprising, although not to my knowledge mentioned elsewhere, that the present participle *iterans* is by far the most common form; it is perhaps not simply a coincidence that in Old French, too, *errant* is especially common² and has proved its vitality (cf. supra *chevalier errant*, etc.).

It would take far too long to go into the details of these developments,³ generally neglected as they are. They arise, as we have seen, partly by a conscious alteration of meaning based on some notion of etymology, partly by

¹ Eranos XLIV, p. 343.

² When explaining this word it is also necessary to take into consideration the Latin ablative of the gerund *iterando* (FUCHS l. c., pp. 351 f. .

³ See the references given above p. 157, n. 1.

the invention of new forms, which are often startling to the classically trained reader. Some of them can be considered as isolated linguistic experiments, which often misfired; others belonged for a considerable time to the learned or semi-learned literary language; others again can be shown by their Romance derivatives to have played an important part in the living language of various parts of the disintegrating Empire. Taken together with other semantic changes which reflect the circumstances of religious, legal, and social life, they help to form a bewildering, but fascinating picture of an epoch when a new world was coming to birth. The accompanying travail finds expression even in the language: the feeling for the old formal structure is weakened, but it would be an undue exaggeration to say that it has disappeared entirely.

CHAPTER IX.

SOME PREPOSITIONS AND PARTICLES

Prepositions and particles are the small change of linguistic currency, and they become worn and defaced the more easily as their phonetic dimensions are the less. Hence it comes about that in Late Latin (as also in Late Greek¹ and elsewhere) we find a number of prepositions, adverbs, and particles at first used in combination, later forming inseparable compounds. The purpose was at first to add precision and exactness to an expression, but gradually the combination in question became purely a strengthened byform, often giving rise to a new single word. I propose to bring forward a few examples which seem to me instructive, to show how important this tendency was in Late Latin of the more vulgar type as well as in the transition to the Romance languages. A lengthier and more detailed exposition of the subject is given by C. HAMP, ALL V, pp. 321 ff., and NORBERG, Beitr., pp. 76 ff.; cf. also SALONIUS, pp. 218 ff.; SVENNUNG, Untersuch., pp. 325 ff.; a short summary is given by BOURCIEZ §§ 125 and 243; the pleonastic combination of particles is discussed in my Syntactica II, pp. 219 ff.; Verm. Stud., pp. 56 ff.

In the new fragments of Pseudo-Soranus, Quaestiones Medicinales (ed. H. STADLER, ALL XIV, pp. 361 ff.) we read on p. 366, 14 ff.: *Caput est principalis pars corporis; dicitur autem ipsius ea pars, qua capilli colliguntur, vertex; quod autem retrorsum est, occipitium; verum quod dabunt [e] bregma; quae autem dextra laevaue sunt ... nos tempora dicimus.* Now this *dabunt*

¹ On compound prepositions and adverbs in Greek see SCHWYZER, Synt., pp. 428 ff.; LEIV AMUNDSEN, Συμπλοή, Serta Rudbergiana (Symb. Osl., fasc. supplet. IV, 1931), pp. 85 ff.; on pleonasm in the use of particles (ὥς ἵνα, ὥς ὅτι, ὥς ὅτε, ἕως ὥς, etc.) see JANNARIS §§ 1754; 1767; 1785 f.; BLASS-DEBRUNNER § 396, Anhang, p. 65; MOULTON, p. 336; RADERMACHER, p. 32; LINNÉR, pp. 89 ff. (further bibliography); KRUMBACHER, Ein vulgärgriechischer Weiberspiegel (Sitz.-Ber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1905), p. 359.

has been altered by the corrector to *dabant*; but even without this it is obvious that the true emendation (cf. my Beitr. p. 121) is: *quod autem retrorsum est, occipitium, verum: quod ab ante, bregma*.¹ The gain is two-fold: the passage makes sense, and we have a further example of the important adverb *abante* to add to the very few given in Thes. L. Lat. I 48. One of these latter is Baruch 6,5 *visa . . . turba de retro et ab ante*, which is illuminating in that it embodies two examples of a combination that became important in the Romance languages; cf. It. *avanti*, Fr. *avant*, etc.; It. *dietro*, Fr. *derrière*, from *de retro*.

On the origin of *abante*,² which is a typical example of this class of formation, BOURCIEZ remarks (§ 125): "tout en indiquant le sens du mouvement, on a voulu définir aussi la place qu'occupait d'abord l'objet: *tollite fratres vestros abante faciem* (Levit. 10,4 Itala) se décompose en *ab + ante faciem* (situation primitive). Les deux particules ainsi rapprochées se sont facilement soudées, et ces compositions souvent adverbiales au début sont aussi devenues prépositionnelles." A similar case is, e. g., that of *de inter* (HAMP 348; NORBERG 82), cf. Itala (Lugd.), Num. 14,13 *eduxisti populum hunc de inter illos*, where the Vulgate expresses the same meaning by *de quorum medio*; the Septuagint simply has *ἐξ αὐτῶν*.³

But it is important to bear in mind that *ab* and *de* in expressions of this kind do not always have separative force, and may equally be applied to a state of rest, as NORBERG maintains in a clear and instructive article partly written as polemic against SÄVBORG's book,⁴ which is, however, well worthy of attention. The latter tried i. a. to maintain the purely separative meaning of *de inter*, but NORBERG (p. 88) has shown by examples not previously adduced that a purely static meaning must often be assigned, as Cod. Dipl. Long. I 37,6 (A.D. 710) *de nostris rebus quod nobis advenerit de inter germanos nostros*. Examples of *de* and *ab* in similar functions occur fairly early, cf. Itala, Matth.

¹ On *bregma*, Gr. *βρέγμα* = *βρεχμός* see Thes. L. Lat. s. v. STADLER saw that emendation was necessary, but proposed *quod abinde est*, with a less suitable adverb and an otiose *est*. — Ibid. 367,16 we read: *usque ad inguina tam in ante quam retro*.

² In Medieval Latin we find even *per ante*: cf. Joh. de Alta Silva Dolopath. ed. HILKA (SMT 5), p. 68,16 *transeunte autem per ante huius domum exercitu . . .* Cf. also DU CANGE s. v. *perante*.

³ Likewise in the Gesta apud Zenophilum 4 (GEBHARDT, Ausgew. Märtyreracten, 192,27), a passage which HAMP (p. 348) has missed.

⁴ T. SÄVBORG, Étude sur le rôle de la préposition *de* dans les expressions de lieu relatives en latin vulgaire et ancien gallo-roman, Thèse, Uppsala 1941.

7,15 *abintus autem sunt lupi rapaces* (Vulg. *intrinsecus*, Gr. *ἔσωθεν*); Vitae Patrum 3,92 *sed sicut sum de foris, ita sum de intus*. We may note in passing that not only *de foris* (It. *difuori*, Fr. *dehors*, etc.), but also *deinter*, *deintro*, *deintus* have living derivatives in the Romance tongues.¹

In fact *de* and especially *in* became little more than a sort of productive prefix for new formations of this kind. The results are sometimes surprising. The combination *in antea* (NORBERG, Beitr., pp. 89 f.), attested with a local significance in Itin. Theod. 28 (CSEL XXXIX, 148,23) *nullatenus potuerunt eum (sc. lapidem) in antea movere*, was not expressive enough for the taste of a later age, and was padded out with *de*: *denantea* from *de* + *in antea*.² Cf. Cod. Dipl. Long. I 129,10 (A.D. 725–726) *de prelecto ariale denantea petis undecede* (i. e. *pedes undecim*) *et ex alia parte de traverso petis tredecce*. In the same meaning we also find *denante* (from *de in ante*) in Compos. Lucens. K 3 (p. 23 HEDFORS); cf. It. *dinanzi*.³

We have remarked that these combinations represent a type of formation characteristic for Vulgar Latin, and it is not surprising that the Roman grammarians frequently warn us against them: cf. Sergius (GrL IV 517,24) *nemo* (i. e. no educated man!) *enim dicit de post forum, nemo ab ante*; Cledonius (ibid. V 21,22) *deintus et de foris non dicimus*; another quotation to the same effect in BOURCIEZ § 125. But the tendency must have been a very old one. A striking example is *demagis* in Lucilius (527 MARX) which has no parallel in all the rest of Latin literature. The old grammarians were gruelled by it, and no less a man than LACHMANN declared it corrupt.⁴ The first to explain it correctly and to point out the Spanish derivative *demás* 'furthermore', 'besides', was the great Romance scholar FRIEDRICH DIEZ. The point well illustrates the method of approach for these questions: with our

¹ On these formations see MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 2526–2528; VON WARTBURG, FEW III 31. — For the late and rare *de intro* HAMP 347 f. gives a few examples from the Lex Salica. On *de ultra* (*deultra*) cf. HAMP 353; HOFMANN 508; Ital. *d'oltre*.

² There appears to be a temporal *de in antea* in CAPASSO, Monumenta II:1, p. 70 (A.D. 955).

³ G. BRONZINI in Atti dell' Acad. dei Lincei, Ser. VIII, Rendiconti, Classe di Scienze morali etc., Vol. VII (1952), p. 103, gives examples of *dinanti da* from a legend of A.D. 1394. On *denante* in medieval Spanish documents see MENÉNDES PIDAL, Orígenes, p. 373; J. BASTARDAS PARERA (title given above p. 6, p. 99; ibid. p. 85 on *in ab antea*, *in avantea*, *ad inantea*, and similar combinations.

⁴ See MARX ad loc.; BÜCHELER, Rh. Mus. XXXVII, pp. 523 f. — A late and very rare *amagis* has been remarked by NORBERG 77, note (saec. VIII).

fragmentary knowledge of spoken Latin even one isolated example may be of great value, and yet we must be truly critical of the transmitted text — or the text said to be transmitted — as we shall see next.

For full details I refer the reader to the works of HAMP and especially NORBERG; I shall content myself here with a few striking or disputed examples. There is a very puzzling and hitherto unnoticed *in inde* occurring no less than five times in MARINI's *Papiri diplomatici* (Rome 1805), nr. 130 (A.D. 950). The simplest thing will be to quote the occurrences: on p. 195: *et cum omnibus ad suprascriptum casale in inde pertinentibus*; *ibid. nec non et fundum in inde qui vocatur Tertium cum terris sementaritiis, campis, pratis, pascuis, cultum vel incultum et cum omnibus ad se generaliter et in inde pertinentibus*; p. 196: *id est curte una in inde qui vocatur Sancti Genesii*; *ibid. et cum omnibus a suprascripta curte generaliter et in inde pertinentibus*.

What does this *in inde* mean? Formally it is reminiscent of *inibi*, *exinde*, *de unde*, etc., and one may think for a moment of the much earlier use of *inde* for *ibi* and *unde* for *ubi* with certain verbs of motion noted by CAVALLIN and SVENNUNG.¹ But interpretation along these lines would involve insuperable difficulties; in particular the formula *omnibus ... generaliter et in inde pertinentibus* seems to me impossible even in a late and rather vulgar document. In all five places I consider *in inde* to be a mere corruption of *in integrum* or *in integro*. The last example would then become *omnibus ... generaliter et in integrum pertinentibus*, which is fully guaranteed by the following parallels: MARINI nr. 136 (A.D. 879) *omnibus ad eandem terre sement. generaliter et in integrum pertinentibus*; 105 (A.D. 984) *et cum omnibus a supradicto Monte generaliter et in integrum pertinentibus*; CAPASSO, *Monumenta* II:1, p. 17 (Regesta Neapolitana of the year 912) *una cum ... omnibus eis ... generaliter et in integro pertinentibus*; *ibid.*, p. 66 (A.D. 954) *cum ... omnibus eis generaliter et in integro pertinentibus*; *ibid.* II:2 (Diplomata et chartae ducum Neapolis), p. 9 (A.D. 949) *cum introitum suum et omnibus sibi generaliter et in integro pertinentibus*.²

As for the expressions quoted above: *fundum in inde qui vocatur Tertium*

¹ S. CAVALLIN, *Zum Bedeutungswandel von lat. unde und inde*, Kgl. hum. vetenskaps-samf. i Lund årsberättelse 1935–36, I, pp. 3 ff.; SVENNUNG, *Untersuch.*, pp. 615 f.

² A variant which also labours hard to convey a notion of totality is MARINI nr. 102 (A.D. 961) *dono et do ... casale uno ... cum omnibus ad ipso casale generaliter et universis pertinentibus*.

and *curte una in inde qui vocatur Sancti Genesii*, in both of which I propose to read *in integrum* (or *in integro*), the following parallel may be adduced from the same document: *casale uno in integro qui appellatur Palumbario*; cf. also MARINI nr. 100 (A.D. 945) *casale in integrum quod vocatur Monsaureus*; 94 (A.D. 625) *horticellum in integro positum juxta domum eius*; 106 (A.D. 998) *integram medietatem* ('one half') *de Castello in integrum, quod vocatur Pauli, et medietatem de Castello in integrum, quod vocatur Sancto Johanne*. There is no need for further examples; the strange *in inde* is nothing more than a wrong expansion of a contraction for *in integrum* (*integro*).¹

A more important problem, and one which has been keenly debated, concerns the origin of the French *ainsi*. Without attempting to solve the problem in its entirety, I will draw attention to ROHLFS' paper (Neuphilol. Mitteil. 1921, pp. 128 ff.), in which he demonstrates² — "d'une manière irréfutable" says SANDFELD, Litteris IV, p. 163 — that the starting point for this word is, beside other forms, *in sic*, O. Fr. *ensi*, cf. Lomb. *insi*, etc. In this *in sic* ROHLFS sees not the local *in*, but the modal *in*, "das auch in *parler en jaloux* erscheint, ferner in *en vain*, *in guisa*, *in questo modo*, *en voz alta*, etc." That the local use of *in* is impossible in this case is perfectly true, but I feel that ROHLFS has bundled together here too distinct uses of *in*. In any case the type of construction *parler en jaloux*, *agir en soldat*, etc. can be explained independently; *en* here carries on the meaning of Latin *in* signifying 'in the character of'. The problem is treated at greater length above pp. 34 ff. This *in sic* which ROHLFS rightly postulates although it is at present unattested, is a formation of the same type as those which we have already mentioned, and need arouse no more scepticism than, e. g., *in aliter* (NORBERG, Beitr. 80), *in denuo*, etc. A different way of strengthening *sic* is discussed below pp. 175 f. (*ita sic*, *sic ita*, etc.).

A very difficult question, and one which has been keenly debated in recent years, is the origin of French *jusque*. DIEZ (Et. Wb. 622) derived it from *de-usque*, remarking very truly on *de*: "Dass die präp. *de* der richtung nach einem ziele nicht geradezu widerspricht, beweist fr. *devers*, versus." But another great Romance scholar, ADOLF TOBLER, objects that it is very difficult to see what

¹ Cf. MARINI 98 (saec. IX med.) *cum omnibus ad easd. in int pertinentibus*; 127 (saec. X) has alternately *in int* and *in integro*. In other documents also *in integrum* is written compendiously: cf. Cod. Dipl. Long. II, pp. 219,9 and 220,8 (in a donation of A.D. 767); in both cases the ms. simply has *in' n'*.

² Cf. also H. KJELLMAN in *Mélanges de Philol.*, off. à Johan Vising (1925), pp. 172 ff.

the force of this *de* could ever have been (Arch. f. das Studium d. neueren Sprachen XCIV, p. 462). He declared himself to be firmly convinced that Latin *inde usque* gave rise to *enjusque*, which is common in Old French, and that the first syllable was later dropped "da die vermeintliche Präposition *en* hier unpassend schien." TOBLER's authority seems to have prevailed with most recent writers; both GAMILLSCHEG and MEYER-LÜBKE refer to him and derive the word from *inde usque*. The former says that *jusque* "ist fälschlich losgelöst aus afrz. *enjusque*, *enjesque*, *enjosque*, indem *en* als Präposition gefasst wurde"; the latter (REV, 3. ed., 4368) is briefer, and simply says under *inde*: "Zssg. frz. (*en*)*jusque*, prov. *enjusca* „bis". Tobler, Arch. 94, 462." In the first edition (9095) he characterized the derivation from *de usque* as: "begrifflich nicht gerechtfertigt," but in the third edition this sentence is omitted and no reference at all is made to DIEZ' hypothesis.

A new and radically different solution was proposed by LERCH II, pp. 38 f., who tried to derive *jusque* from *jus* + *que*, taking O. Fr. *jus* 'down (to)' (from Lat. *deorsum*) as his starting point: e. g., *jus qu'en la mer* '(down) right to the ocean'. He remarks that, if one takes *inde usque* as the original, one would expect *enjusque* to be attested earlier than *jusque*, whereas in fact the reverse is the case. This is a very important argument and must be faced; but the etymology that LERCH proposes seems to lack evidence and to have little intrinsic probability.¹

The most detailed treatment in recent years is that of PAUL FALK in his article '*Jusque* et autres termes en ancien français et en ancien provençal marquant le point d'arrivée' (Thèse, Uppsala 1934); see esp. pp. 93 ff. and 103 ff. He rightly rejects the hypothesis of LERCH, but also rejects the derivation from *de usque*.² Such a formation, says he (p. 103), is impossible in Late Latin; and he adds rather too categorically: "On ne connaît pas de procédé en bas latin par lequel *de* serait employé comme un pur moyen de remplissage, à la manière de l'anc. français." I find it hard to reconcile this with his words on p. 102: "Pourtant, il arrive en bas latin que le sens de la composition tombe en oubli et que la préposition composée n'ait pas d'autre valeur que la préposition simple. C'est l'exception." The fact is, as we have

¹ It is rightly rejected by, e. g., BOURCIEZ (Rev. crit. 1934, p. 192) and by DAUZAT in his Dict. étymol. (7. ed.). LERCH gives a new explanation of *enjusque* also, which I cannot discuss in detail. I feel sure that the accepted explanation of this word is the right one (cf. below).

² FALK and BOURCIEZ remain content with the derivation from *inde usque*.

previously seen, that *de* in combinations of the kind we are discussing may have either a separative sense or one that is purely static and local, and that *de* and *in* were especially liable to become nothing more than a productive prefix. There remains a further point, which to my mind is decisive: *de usque*, although hitherto unobserved, is in fact attested in Late and Vulgar Latin: cf. Cod. Dipl. Long. I 240,6 (A.D. 745) *ita volo . . . quod (h)abeo in finibus Plum-bense, ut diebus vite Gallani et Rodolende germane mee atque filias meas¹ Anselda et Galla omnia metietate (i. e. medietatem 'the half') de usufructuario, de usque ad una de ipsis aduixerit et ipsa avidum (i. e. habitum) religionis . . . in ipso monasterio conservaverit, . . . ipso usufructu, ut supra dixi, metietatem percurat (i. e. percurrat).*

I am well aware that for phonetic reasons (cf. FALK p. 103) examples from an earlier and purer period of Latin, say the fifth or sixth century, would be better as confirmation of the derivation from *de usque*,² but I can only repeat what I said above (pp. 165 f.) on the inadequacy of our knowledge of late Vulgar Latin, and I believe that more careful research into the numerous documents written by more or less uneducated scribes of the transitional period will sooner or later discover the examples which we require.

It is necessary then, in my opinion at least, to start from *de usque* on the one hand, giving rise to *jusque*, and on the other from *inde usque* giving rise to *enjusque*, *enjosque*, etc. But the detailed relationship of these forms to one another must be left for the Romance philologists to solve.

The combination of more or less synonymous prepositions is rather uncommon, and not always easy to explain. Extensive material has been collected by HAMP 327; NORBERG, Beitr., pp. 77 f.; SVENNUNG, Untersuch., pp. 336 f., and esp. ALMA XXI (1951), pp. 63 ff; cf. also Syntactica II, pp. 231 f., to which some further material can now be added: e. g., Chron. Vulturn. (Fonti LIX), p. 289,21 (A.D. 984) *per ex iussione supradicti gloriosi principis*; ibid. p. 323,23 (A.D. 988) *absque sine legali iudicio*. NORBERG adduces two examples of *ad iuxta*, one of which is Cod. Dipl. Long. II, p. 426,17

¹ Cf. in the same document p. 241,17 *et sunt ipsas casas in fondo Trecio*. For further details on this nom. pl. in -as see Syntactica II, pp. 331 ff.; NORBERG, Synt. Forsch., pp. 27 ff.; VÄÄNÄNEN in Neuphil. Mitteilungen XXXV, pp. 81 ff.; SAS, p. 75 ff.; 502; GAMILLSCHEG, Rom. Forsch. LX, pp. 793 f.; BATTISTI, Avviamento, p. 201.

² Cf. FALK p. 103: "*De usque* gallo-rom. aurait donc donné *dusque*, mais pas *jusque*. Cette forme *jusque* postule un **de usque* latin cf. *de orsu* > *jos* comme *diurnum* > *jor*), qui paraît impossible . . ." I cannot, for the reasons I have given above, persuade myself of its impossibility.

ad iuxta mensura mensurata (modal = *secundum*); with this we may compare Cod. Dipl. di Genova (Fonti LXXVII), p. 62,4 (A.D. 1130) *si aliqua femina maritum accepit vel acceperit ad secundum usum et consuetudinem huius terre* (but in another document, *ibid.* p. 66,15 simply: *secundum usum terre*). As early as Gaius (Digest XVIII 6,16) we find: *duraturam bonitatem . . . usque ad in eum diem*,¹ similarly in Oribas. Lat., Syn. VI 11, versio Aa (saec. VI–VII) *a primo usque ad in fine*,² at a later period cf. Form. Bitur.,³ append. p. 180,2 *ad in aevum custodire decrevimus*. The grammarian Pompeius (GrL V, p. 273,26) refers to the combination *apud penes*, and says that it cannot form “unam partem orationis.” This may of course be an invented example, although I cannot see any reason why it should be. Immediately afterwards Pompeius remarks: *qui male loquuntur, modo (= nunc) ita dicunt: de post illum ambulat*,⁴ A strange use of *erga* appears in a couple of urban Roman inscriptions: CIL VI 6469 (saec. I) *ob pietatem erga in se*; VI 8543 *erga de se bene merenti*.

Such expressions as these must undoubtedly be to some extent pure accidents, and may even be due to a mere slip of the pen in some or other late document. But there is no reason for a general scepticism towards the tendency itself, especially as similar combinations can be found also in early Romance texts, although only sporadically, so far as I know. Thus in ‘Fueros de la Novenera’, edited by TILANDER,⁵ we find (314): *de por mandamiento del alcalde* ‘at the command of’ (cf. the passage from Chron. Vulturn. quoted above: *per ex iussione principis*); likewise, according to TILANDER p. 194, O. Port. *per de furto* (see also p. 33). In the particular case of *erga* it is to be noted that this preposition occurs in pleonastic combination in another group of cases, which I shall deal with shortly. It is also true that in Late Latin the meaning of *erga* became rather vague; we sometimes find it where we should expect *iuxta*, *secundum*, *prope*, or even *apud*.⁶ Hence it is easier to understand why

¹ In the *deteriores in* is missing.

² In both cases the expression may have been made rather easier by the incipient tendency of *usque ad* to become a mechanical formula. Nevertheless so early an example as that from Gaius arouses some doubt.

³ Here as elsewhere I cite after the edition of the Merov. and Carol. formulae by ZEUMER, MGH, Leg. Sect. V.

⁴ On *depost* see above p. 165; MEYER-LÜBKE REW 6684 (Port. and N. Ital. *depos* and many other forms).

⁵ *Leges Hispanicae medii aevi*, edendas curavit GUNNAR TILANDER, II (Stockholm 1951).

⁶ Cf. Thes. L. Lat. V:2. 755,38 ff.

it should have been strengthened and made more precise by the addition of *de*, or *in*, or the like. For practical purposes it has left hardly any traces in the Romance languages.¹

A combination which deserves notice is that of *de* with *ex* or *ab*; examples however are very infrequent: cf. CIL XIV 5210 *vixit cum eo de ex. die virginitatis sue*; the compound *deexhortari* occurs in Didasc. Apost. 43,25 (p. 61 HAULER; 201 CONNOLLY) *valde depopulatus est ecclesiam multos de exhortans et adoptans sibi, et gentiles seducebat magicis operationibus*.² For *de ab* cf. Form. Andecav. IV (p. 6,15) *de ab odiernum diae*; Form. Sal. Merkel. XII (p. 245,39) *de ab hac die*; further examples in SVENNUNG, ALMA XXI, pp. 66 f.; cf. also ARNALDI, *ibid.* X, p. 153. It is perhaps to *de ex* that we must look for the original of French *dès* and cognate forms in other Romance languages; cf. ÉLISE RICHTER, ZRPh XXXII, pp. 673 ff.; VON WARTBURG, FEW; MEYER-LÜBKE, REW s. v. *de ex*, although with less conviction than the others. The question must be left open; other authorities derive *dès* from *de ipso*.³ I feel rather more certainty in the derivation of the much debated Italian *da* from *de a(b)*. On this point see ÉLISE RICHTER, *Ab im Romanischen* (1904), pp. 32 ff.; but especially the fundamental discussion by SVENNUNG in ALMA XXI (1951), pp. 55 ff. His examples and his arguments seem to me in general convincing.⁴ The same result was arrived at simultaneously by AEBISCHER in an important article in *Cultura Neolatina* XI (1951), pp. 5 ff., based principally on Italian documents of the Middle Ages. NIEDERMANN's attempt⁵ to derive *da* from Oscan *dat*, which he supposes to have been taken over into colloquial Latin and to have maintained its place "dans une certaine mesure" alongside *de*, is not convincingly documented.⁶

¹ To some extent the same thing happens to *penes*, which hardly had any firm hold in late popular language. It does not occur in Aetheria, Commodian, Anthimus, or in the Querolus, etc., or in the Romance languages. It is therefore quite conceivable that it would be strengthened by adding *apud* (cf. the preceding page).

² On *desante* (from *de ex ante*) see BASTARDAS PARERA, *op. cit.* p. 99.

³ MEYER-LÜBKE, Gr. III § 250; for an acute analysis of the causes see SÄVBORG in *Mélanges de Philol. off. à Johan Melander* (Uppsala 1943), pp. 1 ff.

⁴ He speaks on p. 67 of "un stade intermédiaire entre *de ab* et le *da* fusionné ... attesté dans les formes *dab* et *dau* (devant voyelle)." The combination *de ad*, which some scholars assume, lacks satisfactory evidence and seems semantically improbable.

⁵ MAX NIEDERMANN, *Notes de critique verbale sur quelques textes médicaux latins*, Coimbra 1948 (Faculté des lettres de l'université de Coimbra), pp. 31 f.

⁶ Cf. against the derivation from Oscan *dat* MEYER-LÜBKE, ZRPh XXV, pp. 602 ff.

A rather special place belongs to the enclitic *cum*. It is not hard to understand that in the forms *mecum*, *tecum*, *quocum*, etc. the suffix might, at least in the mind of the uneducated, come to lose some of its force, so that another preposition would be added. Hence we find the strange expressions, CIL VI 16414 *con quacom*; XI 5779 *con quicu*. Such forms as *cum mecum*, *cum tecum* must have existed in the vulgar language, since we find direct derivatives in Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, both in the early and the late periods of the languages: It. *con meco*, *con teco*, etc., Sp. and Port. *conmigo*, *contigo*, etc. On these forms and their variants see MEYER-LÜBKE III § 713 and the important monograph of SANTESSON.¹ On the question of their origin the latter, to my mind rightly, observes (p. 78): "la plus forte preuve en faveur d'une formation déjà latine est la fréquence de ces pléonasmes dans la vieille littérature des trois langues ... il y a bien des phénomènes du bas latin qui n'apparaissent point dans la littérature, mais qu'on a pourtant le droit de supposer avec assez de probabilité en raison du consensus de plusieurs langues romanes." As far as Italian is concerned, in which SANTESSON has amassed a very great number of examples, it is particularly in the language of every day, in familiar speech, and in dialect that the pleonastic expressions are common (op. cit. pp. 103; 113). But on the other hand we find in Manzoni for example such phrases as *conjerir con meco*.

It has hitherto, I think, escaped attention that *mecum*, *nobiscum*, etc. in Medieval Latin may sometimes receive the addition of *erga*: *erga mecum*, etc., a phenomenon which illustrates the weakening of the force of the suffix. A number of examples occur in the Placiti Cassinesi (saec. X),² edited by INGUANEZ; cf. p. 11 (A.D. 960) *dum ... die quadam erga nobiscum adessent*; ibid. *erga secum habendo Petrum clericum et notarium abbocatorem predicti sui monasterii*; p. 12 (960) *erga secum habendo predictum abbocatorem suum*; p. 15 (963) *dum ... die ... quadam erga nobiscum adessent plures viros (i. e. viros)*; p. 16 (963) *Gaido presbiter et abbas erga secum habendo Ursam abbocatorem suum* (so also p. 18); p. 20 *erga mecum*; p. 23 (963) *erga secum habendo Vigelmum iudicem advocatorem supra dicti monasterii*.³

¹ C. G. SANTESSON, *La particule cum comme préposition dans les langues romanes*, Thèse pour le doctorat, Paris 1921.

² *Miscellanea Cassinese V* (1930).

³ But *erga* by itself p. 23: *erga nos ante eum residentibus* (roughly = *cum*), an example (taken together with *erga nobiscum*, etc.) of the vagueness in the meaning of *erga*, mentioned above, p. 170.

Although in this case there is obviously little more than a mechanical formula, I think that the matter is not without some interest. To some extent it can be linked with a peculiar development in the Romance languages which also illustrates the weakening of such forms as *mecum*, It. *meco*, cf. MEYER-LÜBKE III §§ 59 and 713 on "die Ausbildung von *meco* zum Präpositionalis." Derivatives of such forms, as *mek* and *tek* occur in Matera (Basilicata in southern Italy), but only after prepositions: *a tek*, *da tek*.¹ For further details on this development see ROHLFS, Hist. Gramm. d. ital. Spr. II § 443, who remarks: "In Süditalien sind gelegentlich diese Formen in Verkennung ihrer präpositionellen Geltung zur Bedeutung des einfachen betonten Pronomens gelangt." He quotes, besides Luc. (Matera) *a mek* 'a me', such forms as Neap. *io e ttico* 'io e tu', from other dialects *ri tiecu* 'di te'; for further details see ROHLFS loc. cit.

Every student of historical linguistics knows that prepositions were originally adverbs, and that in the earliest periods the distinction between them is not clearly maintained. Thus arises so-called *tmesis*, that is to say the more or less accidental separation of a preposition from the verb or noun with which it is compounded. In such cases the preposition regains with its independent status something of its original adverbial function. Thus in early Latin we find such forms as those quoted by Paul. Fest. *ob vos sacro* for *obsecro vos*, *sub vos placo* for *supplicio vos*, etc.; Lex XII tab. *endoque plorato* (= *imploratoque*); Enn., Ann. 381 *Hannibal audaci cum pectore de me hortatur*, etc.² But in these examples, and even more in Lucretius,³ such expressions are mainly intentional archaisms, and occur particularly in religious and legal contexts. On a special example in Plautus (Trin. 833) see ED. FRAENKEL, Plautinisches im Plautus 209; the expression is undoubtedly taken from the language of high poetry.

What is more surprising is that Late Latin also provides a good many examples of *tmesis* (see my Peregr. Aeth. 187 f.; for some later examples see NORBERG, Eranos XLIII, pp. 314 f.). There are no less than eight examples in

¹ Another example showing how completely the feeling for the real meaning of *seco*, etc. was lost, is the type *seco lui* (*seco lei*, *seco loro*, etc.); cf. MEYER-LÜBKE III § 67; in more detail SANTESSON, 140 ff.; see also ROHLFS, op. cit. II § 480.

² On *tmesis* in general see Syntactica II, pp. 402 ff. (detailed bibliography); WACKER-NAGEL II, pp. 171 f.; 175; HOFMANN 495; MAROUZEAU, RPh XLV, 184.

³ Numerous examples are given by MUNRO on I 452; cf. also the large edition of BAILEY, vol. I, Prolegomena, p. 123. *Tmesis* is most common in Lucretius with *inter* (and *in*).

Ambrosiaster of *de non sunt* (*est, erant, etc.*) *qui*, and one example of *de non fiat*; cf. also Eugippius, Exc. Aug., p. 262,24 *de non fuerit*. Aetheria writes (c. 49,2) *qui . . . tantae sollemnitati inter non fuerit*, and tmesis of *interesse* occurs elsewhere also, as Anthol. Lat. (ed. RIESE) 345,14 *iustis inter videt esse catervis*; Lucifer Cal., p. 3,8 and 247,27 (with postponed *inter*); in the early Middle Ages cf., e. g., Liutprandi leg. 15,1 *si homines inter non fuerint, quando . . .*¹

These and similar constructions have been usually, and I think rightly, considered as half way learned, more or less intentional archaisms on the part of the authors who wrote the works in question. But there are some remarkable exceptions which show that in some cases tmesis belonged to the living, spoken language, and this not only in early Latin, but even in the latest period. This of course is interesting in view of the Romance development. The most persistent tmesis is that of the intensive *per*: we find it in the colloquial Latin of Terence, as Andr. 486 *per ecastor scitus puer est natus Pamphilo*; and in Cicero, De or. II 67,271 *per mihi scitum videtur*; and with peculiar frequency in the letters, as Att. I 4,3 *per mihi gratum est*; X 1,1 *per enim magni aestimo*; Fam. III 5,3 *per fore accomdatum tibi*; Qu. Fr. II 8 (7), 2 *per mihi benigne respondit*. Similarly in Late Latin, as Gellius II 18,1 *Platoni per fuit familiaris*; Paulus, Digest 22,3,25 *per etenim absurdum est*; Arnob. Jun. Liber ad Gregoriam 12 *perque mirum in modum*; for further material see Syntactica l. c. This construction is continued in Old French, where we find such phrases as *par est granz*, *par sui vedre*, on which see MEYER-LÜBKE III § 494, who draws the analogy with Latin, but does not to my mind give a perfectly clear explanation.

The same may be said of P. FALK's valuable study 'De Trop par est bons à Il est par trop bon' (Studier i modern språkvetenskap IX, Uppsala 1924, pp. 199 ff.). His remarks (p. 205) on the freer order of words in Latin and its importance in this connexion does not seem to me to go any nearer to the root of the matter than do the observations of MEYER-LÜBKE. The examples given above demonstrate the normal Latin word-order: *per* is separated from the word to which it belongs by a more or less unstressed word (often an enclitic, a pronoun or a form of *esse*) in strict accordance with the tendency noticed by WACKERNAGEL in a well known paper (IF I, pp. 133 ff.); cf. Syntactica II, p. 399. O. Fr. *par est granz* is the direct continuation of Latin

¹ Further material in Peregr. Aeth. and in NORBERG, Eranos XLIII, pp. 313 ff. (particularly on *inter*; cf. the last note on the preceding page).

per est grandis (there is no actual example of tmesis with *pergrandis*, but this is probably accidental, since *per . . . magnus* is common enough).

A more surprising phenomenon is the word *prode*, which first appears in Late Latin: *prode est*, *prode sunt*, etc. This is not an original form,¹ but arises from a sort of popular etymology operating on *prodest* and dividing it into *prode* and *est*, on the analogy of *utile est*, *necesse est*, etc. The word *prode* then established itself firmly in Vulgar Latin: it occurs in the Itala (cf. RÖNSCH 468 f.) and in the so-called Sortes Sangallenses, which are usually dated to the beginning of the third century (WINNEFELD: c. 200);² cf. 31,5 *prode tibi erit*; 29,11 *nemo tibi prode est*; 26,4; 44,2. For a later period cf. Peregr. Aeth. 8,3 *prode illis est*; Martyrium Matthaei 21 (Acta Apost. Apocr. II 246,29 LIPSIUS-BONNET) *prode tibi fuerunt*; cf. also my Peregr. Aeth., pp. 184 ff.; Syntactica II, pp. 402 f. (with bibliography); on Oribasius Latinus see SVENNUNG, Wortstudien, p. 112; on Dioscorides Latinus MIHAESCU in Ephemeris Dacoromana VIII (Rome 1938), p. 320; on *prode fit* BOAS in Phil. Woch. 1930, pp. 1403 ff. The live and colloquial character of *prode* is shown by its derivatives in the Romance languages, as Ital. *prode*, which can be a substantive meaning 'use', 'advantage', or an adjective meaning 'sturdy', 'courageous'. On the other Romance forms and their mutual relations, which are not yet fully explained, see DIEZ, Et. Wb. 256 f.; TOBLER, Verm. Beitr. I (3. Aufl.), 141; MEYER-LÜBKE, REW 6766.

Whilst we have seen that pleonastic combination of synonymous prepositions is not a common feature of Vulgar Latin,³ the reverse is true of pleonasm in the use of conjunctions and particles, so that expressions like *etiam et*,⁴ *quasi sicut*, *et atque utinam*, etc. are fairly common. After going unnoticed for a long time, this idiom has received so much and such thorough treatment from scholars that I shall content myself with a bare outline and a few new examples.⁵

In Epiphanius, Interpr. Evangel., p. 109,17 (ed. A. ERIKSON) we find: *non ita sic intellegendum est*; similarly Theod. Prisc. Eupor. II 7, 25 *de his*

¹ On the prefix *pro-*, *prod-* see ERNOUT-MEILLET s. v.

² According to DOLD, Sitz.-Ber. d. Wiener Akad., Phil.-hist. Kl. CCXXV, 4, p. 15 they date from the latter part of the fourth century.

³ See above pp. 169 ff.

⁴ Often emended out by editors, but it occurs as early as Bell. Afr. 57,4 and Mela III 63; in Late Latin it is the most common of all particle pleonasms; cf. my Verm. Stud. pp. 66 f.; HOFMANN, p. 662.

⁵ Cf. my Peregr. Aeth. pp. 59 ff.; Syntactica II, pp. 219 ff. (bibliography); Verm. Stud., pp. 56 ff.; HOFMANN, pp. 685 f.; 829 f.

Hippocrates ... ita sic sua sententia iudicavit; for another example from the Querolus see G. RANSTRAND, *Querolusstudien*,¹ p. 94. In the same sense *sic ita* occurs in the letters of Ruricius, p. 448,9 *sic ita concedat divina miseratio, ut ...*; frequently in texts of the early Middle Ages, as Cod. Dipl. Long. I, p. 31,16 (A.D. 700); I 123,17 (724); I 213,14 (739); I 226,11 (739/40), et passim; I 125,15 (724) *sic ita et in ea ratione, ut ...*; Vulg., Ep. ad Galat. 1,6 *sic tam cito*, but the Greek simply has οὕτως ταχέως. The French colloquialism *si tellement* strikingly recalls Late Latin *sic taliter*, Regula Macar. 1; Cartae Senonicae (768–775),² p. 191,12 and 191,31; *ita taliter*, e. g., Adamnan, Vita s. Columbae I 43 (p. 116,32 FOWLER). On *ita* it may be remarked that unlike *sic* — which plays an important part in the Romance vocabulary, It. *si*, Fr., Prov., Sp. *si*, etc. — it becomes very much weakened in its meaning in Late Latin, and therefore is often strengthened by the addition of a synonym (HOFMANN, *Umgangsspr.* 41).

Expressions of the type *itaque ideo, itaque propter hoc*, which are quite well attested in Classical Latin (Varro and others), are continued in the later period by the rather more striking *sic hoc modo, ita hoc pacto, ubique in omni loco, undique ex omni parte*, etc.³ The second element here completes, clarifies, and, as it were, rounds off the former, but in effect it is a pure pleonasm, and critics have often postulated a gloss in such cases. A similar phenomenon occurs in Aetheria 24,1 *singulis diebus cotidie* (adding precision and clearness) and in Medieval Latin, as Liutprandi leg. 95 *modo presenti tempore*; Chron. Vulturn. (Fonti LIX), p. 331,11 (A.D. 996) *nunc presenti tempore* (the same phrase recurs, p. 334,25; 339,8; 343,14, etc.). Analogous expressions in Romance tongues are Spanish *oi en este dia* 'hodie in isto die'; *siempre toda sazon* 'always at all seasons', etc. (MEYER-LÜBKE III § 496). The following constructions have not, I think, been noticed: ACO I: 4, p. 166,13 *adhuc sunt malivoli hactenus circa illum*; Acta Andr. p. 75,7 BLATT *adhuc usque actenus*; cf. in Medieval Latin, e. g., Chron. Salern.,⁴ p. 485,40 *inlaesa usque nunc actenus manet* (sc. civitas); Guido de Columnis, Hist. destruct. Troiae (1287),⁵ p. 221 *hactenus usque nunc*.

¹ Diss. Göteborgs Högskola, Stockholm 1951.

² MGH, Leg. sect. V.

³ Cf. Verm. Stud., pp. 65 f.; WISTRAND in Apophoreta Gotoburgensia Vilelmo Lundström oblata (Göteborg 1936), p. 44; AXELSON, Neue Senecastudien (Lund 1939), p. 72, note; SVENNUNG, Orosiana, pp. 100 f.; NORBERG, Greg. Magn. II, p. 185; BIELER, Class. et mediaev. XI, p. 147.

⁴ MGH, Script. III.

⁵ Ed. by GRIFFIN, Cambridge (Mass.) 1936.

On the causal combination *quia cum* (Lucifer Calar., Iul. Valer., and others) see Verm. Stud., p. 62. To the examples cited there may be added ACO I:3, p. 163,14 *quia enim cum deus esset, homo fieri voluit*; in the Greek text simply ἐπεὶ δὲ γὰρ θεὸς ἦν. Similarly we find that in Late Latin, where *siquidem* is often used as a causal conjunction, pleonasms occur like *siquidem quoniam* (Itinerar. Alex. 4), *siquidem quod* (Sulp. Sev. Chron., p. 28,10 HALM), etc.

Among pleonasms in the use of temporal particles we may mention *cum quando* and *dum quando*. Naturally this construction may have been strongly influenced by those cases in which *quando* had its full force as an indefinite, 'once', but there are many examples where either one of the conjunctions would have been enough.¹ Nevertheless we can sometimes detect a rather stronger meaning: 'since, as we know', or partly adversative: 'while still'. A few examples will suffice: Ps.-Aug. Quaestiones p. 316,16 SOUTER (CSEL 50) *quo modo ergo anteriores se putant pagani, cum quando quod colunt post deum est?* Greg. Magn. Epist. IX 5 (II 44,15) *quantum . . . invenimus, moleste illa, quod non decuit, suscepistis, dum quando nihil asperum scripsisse meminimus*. The construction is more purely pleonastic in the following passage, which is typical of the tendency in Vulgar Latin to strengthen and pile up particles: Mulom. Chir. 457 (p. 148,24 ff.) *dissuria (i. e. dysuria) ideo appellatur, cum quando difficiliter urinam facit. Stranguiria appellatur, quia cum quando guttas mittit per veretrum. Ischuria ideo appellatur, quia cum quando lumbos exporrigit ad conatum mictionis et non est meiere*. The Greek original, Hippiatr. Berol. p. 169,11 f. (ODER-HOPPE), has in all three places ὅταν; Pelagonius c. 152 has in each case *quando*.

The same pleonastic tendency is exemplified by the combination *et . . . -que*² which is sometimes found. The commonest class of occurrence is *sibi et posterisque* and the like in inscriptions.³ Obviously this arises purely from contamination of two common and almost mechanical formulae. But there are examples of a different kind, which first occur in late and vulgar texts.⁴ In considering these we must bear in mind that *-que* becomes greatly weakened in Late Latin and disappears from the living language.⁵ Thus we find even in medieval texts such examples as TARDIF, Monuments 70, p. 57

¹ More material in Verm. Stud., pp. 60 f.; NORBERG, Greg. Magn. I, p. 42.

² Cf. also Verm. Stud., pp. 56 ff.

³ KONJETZNY, ALL XV, p. 351; HOFMANN 656 f.

⁴ Verm. Stud., pp. 56 ff. (p. 58 on two examples in Commodian).

⁵ Peregr. Aeth., p. 87; Verm. Stud., pp. 36 ff.; 40.

(A.D. 772) *neque vos neque iuniores seu successoresque vestri*; exactly the same formula occurs in Cod. Dipl. Veronese (ed. V. FAINELLI, 1940), p. 76 in a letter from Charles the Great dated 799; Chron. Vulturn. (Fonti LIX), p. 281,22 (A.D. 1004) *de supradictis monachis vel posterisque successoribus meis*. For examples from Merovingian and Carolingian Formulae (MGH, Leg. sect. V), see Verm. Stud., p. 57, note 3.

Very little attention has been given to the combinations *aut vel* and *vel aut*; cf. Syntactica II, p. 224. Here also the one particle, *vel*, became weakened and fell out of use in the spoken language, and came to be strengthened with *aut*, which remained alive and vigorous (cf. the Romance derivatives, It. *od*, *o*, Fr. *ou*, Prov., Sp. *o*, etc.).

The general tendency of popular language towards intensification of expressions is thus attended in some cases by circumstances which give it a peculiar interest for the student of stylistic or historical linguistics.

An interesting differentiation, not in meaning but in stylistic nuance, has been observed between *nec* and *neque*, which were at first purely phonetic doublets (*nec* originally used before a consonant). An examination of representative texts shows that in the later spoken language *nec* established an ascendancy over *neque*; the latter does indeed occur here and there, but its role is drastically reduced, and in Vulgar Latin it virtually dies out.¹ Thus Aetheria has *nec* 46 times, *neque* only two or three times; in the Mulo-medicina Chironis *nec* is almost universal, only one *neque* occurring p. 48,24; Anthimus, De observ. ciborum has exclusively *nec*. In Commodian also *nec* has a vast predominance (VAN KATWIJK, Lexicon Commod., p. 91). A good illustration of Late Latin usage is afforded by Firmicus Maternus, De errore profanarum religionum; in the writer's own language *nec* is very frequent, and *neque* only occurs three times (each time in the old and stereotyped combination *neque enim*); but in his Biblical quotations the situation is very different. There *neque* is much more common than *nec* (11 cases to 3): that is to say, the writer has followed the translation of the Bible that he was using. An equally good illustration is afforded by the writings of Apuleius, by the rhetorically coloured Apologia on the one hand, and — for all its subtle

¹ For a more detailed examination of the position see Syntactica I (2. Aufl.), pp. 332 ff.; on the usage in poetry, which to some extent follows the same line as the spoken language, see pp. 337 ff. and AXELSON, Unpoetische Wörter (Lund 1945), pp. 115 ff. It may be added that even in so highly rhetorical a poet as Lucan *nec* is vastly more frequent than *neque* (330 times against 28, according to MOONEY's index).

touches — the looser and more colloquial Metamorphoses on the other. In the former *neque* is rather the more common, in the latter *nec* has a great preponderance. For further details see my Syntactica I, pp. 334 f.

In a great many cases there is no mistaking the uneven distribution as exemplified above,¹ and to a large extent the Romance development is in agreement with it, since nearly all the forms go back to the more popular *nec* (an exception is Rum. *nici* from *neque*), cf. GRÖBER ALL IV, p. 131. But it is particularly interesting to see that the predominance of *nec* can be noticed as early as Pompeian wall-inscriptions and Petronius. In the former we find only *nec*, and although the material is not extensive (perhaps fifteen examples²), this can hardly be a statistical accident. The vulgar dialogue in Petronius gives the same picture: always *nec*, never *neque*. The only occurrences of *neque* in Petronius are in the more urbane style of the linking narrative.³

Another surprisingly early anticipation of the Romance development is found in the use of *quare* in a Pompeian inscription, CIL IV 2421 *Rufa, ita vale, quare bene fēlas*. The semantic development which produced Fr. and Prov. *car* from Latin *quare* is to all intents and purposes complete. The starting-point is probably first of all to be sought in such parataxes as that in the verse of a vulgar lampoon against Tiberius: Suet. Tib. 59,1 *non es eques; quare? non sunt tibi milia centum*. Only a change of stress in speaking, or of punctuation in writing, is needed to produce the very construction in question. Parallels can be adduced from the most diverse sources, from Greek, Latin, Romance, and Germanic texts.⁴ WACKERNAGEL observes — to my mind very truly — that *quia*, to judge from the archaic *quianam?*, must originally have meant 'why?'. But it has not been observed that this function is actually attested in

¹ Since there is no such thing as a purely vulgar text, it is hardly surprising that the Oribasius translations, for example, contain a good many cases of *neque* (MORLAND, p. 183); but here also *nec* is the more frequent.

² V. VÄÄNÄNEN, *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions Pompeiennes* (Helsinki 1937), p. 210.

³ Taking Petronius as a whole, there are more than 160 examples of *nec* and only 27 of *neque* (7 of these in the formula *neque enim*).

⁴ WACKERNAGEL, *Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde* (Basel 1897), p. 22; id. IF XXXI, pp. 267 f.; my *Peregr. Aeth.*, pp. 323 f.; NORBERG, *Syntakt. Forschungen*, p. 237, n. 1. On the development of *car* see LERCH I 134 ff.; on the psychological aspect see also LEUMANN, IF XLV, p. 108. The explanations proposed by BOURCIEZ (*Romania* LX, pp. 232 f.) and WINKLER (*Zeitschr. f. franz. Spr. u. Lit.* LXIII, pp. 238 f.) are far-fetched and improbable.

Late Latin, as Lucifer Calar. p. 133,13 *quia cogis facere nos eam rem, per quam puniri mereamur a deo?* It is also interesting that the very common *pourquoi* is used fairly often in modern colloquial French in place of *parce que* 'because'; at least, such is the opinion of so good a judge as MAX BONNET,¹ who says that speakers "prononcent souvent la phrase de telle manière qu'on est tout naturellement amené à cette explication." A similar development took place at a late period in the case of Latin *cur*.²

¹ In a letter to the author 1911.

² Peregr. Aeth. p. 324; Thes. L. Lat. IV 1451. Cf., e. g., Sulp. Sev. Chron. I 35,5 *Saul Abimelech sacerdotem interemit, cur David recepisset.*

CHAPTER X.

TABOO, EUPHEMISM, AND PRIMITIVE CONCEPTIONS IN LANGUAGE

In one of his novels the Danish author HERMAN BANG brings in a celebrated artist meditating upon his own name and says: "The name — the coat of armour around his body, the girdle round his waist."

Here we find in a modern and artistic form a reflection of the age-old notion of the name as a real and almost independent part of the personality. But in past ages and even today among primitive peoples, this notion is fully alive, and finds expression in ways that are both interesting and surprising. It has deeply affected the range of ideas of the human race, and has left its imprint also in the realm of language. According to KNUD RASMUSSEN, the distinguished authority on Greenland, the Greenlanders consider that a man consists of three parts: body, soul, and name; associated with the name are various great powers, and he who inherits a man's name, inherits also his characteristics. Connected with this view is the fear of uttering a dead man's name before anyone has been named after him: if this were done, the power of the name might be dissipated and to some degree lost. This unwillingness to speak the name of the dead is found among primitive peoples in the most diverse parts of the world. An English explorer relates how on one occasion he tried in vain to persuade an Australian aboriginal to tell him the name of another native who had been killed. An account of the dead man's father could be elicited, a description of his appearance and his gait, how he brandished his battle-axe, and other particulars, but fear forbade the pronouncing of his name.

Behind this and similar conceptions lies a circumstance intimately connected with the power of the name: a name is often *taboo*, and must be kept

secret. The word *taboo*, derived from a Polynesian word, means fundamentally 'consecrated', 'forbidden', and is used, as we all know, to signify something that must not be touched or seen, or in many cases even named. A word that is taboo is replaced by a neutral or indifferent word, or to use another Polynesian expression, a *noa*-word. For example, the names of great divinities are taboo; the most celebrated example is *Jehovah* (*Jahveh*), which the Jews venerated so highly that they would not utter it, but replaced it by the name *Adonai* 'my Lord'. In the same way the Romans, according to the consistent testimony of antiquity (Plin. N. H. 3,65; Plut. Quaest. Rom. 58,61; Serv. on Aen. I, 277; Macrobius Sat. III 9,3), kept in the utmost secrecy the name of Rome's tutelary deity. It was forbidden under penalty of death to utter it, or even to enquire whether the deity was a god or a goddess. The learned poet Valerius Soranus, the friend of Cicero and Varro, is said to have been put to death because he was alleged to have spoken it; and to this very day we know neither the god's secret name nor the city's.¹

For similar reasons, until the recent establishment of a Communist regime in China, all Chinese were forbidden to utter the special name *Kien* of Confucius, the founder of their religious system; if it occurred in a text which was to be read aloud, the reader must say instead 'a certain man'. More drastic precautions were taken with the names of reigning emperors: any written character which formed part of his name became taboo throughout China, and its use was forbidden.

A similar and no less significant feeling of taboo has attached itself both in ancient and modern times to the names of priests and religious symbols, to the mention of death or dangerous diseases, to the names of dangerous wild beasts, or of beasts of chase. A mass of material casting light on this phenomenon has been collected by the well-known Romance scholar KR. NYROP, in his brilliant work 'Navnets Magt' (in *Opuscula Philologica. Mindre Afhandlinger udg. af det Philologisk-Historiske Samfund. Copenhagen 1887*), and more recently by W. HAVERS in his most rich and stimulating work 'Neuere Literatur zum Sprachtabu' (Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl., Sitz.-Ber. CCXXIII, 5, 1946). A short but useful account of some typical

¹ Cf. the recent work of A. BRELICH, *Die geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom* (Zürich 1949); also BAYET, REL XXVII (1949), pp. 374 ff.; S. WEINSTOCK, JRS XL (1950), pp. 149 f. Even if Soranus really was a victim of the political strife of 82, it is remarkable that the story appears so well attested (Servius claims to have it from Varro himself). This is a typical example of taboo occurring in the middle of the classical period.

examples is given by OTTO JESPERSEN in his excellent little work 'Mankind, nation and individual from a linguistic point of view',¹ ch. IX. Undoubtedly the notion of taboo, as JESPERSEN says, opens up wide perspectives, and it is certainly going to play an important part in future linguistic researches. But there is some danger that this kind of interpretation may be uncritically and overenthusiastically employed.² The word taboo has to some extent become a watch-word, associated with certain tendencies in contemporary civilization, especially with the modern interest in primitive art and culture, and a critical reaction against its over-use would perhaps not be undesirable.

Even a very short selection from the innumerable examples of linguistic taboo would take up more space than we can spare.³ I shall simply mention,

¹ First published under the title 'Menneskehed, nasjon og individ i sproget', Oslo 1925. My reference is to the English edition, London 1946.

² SPECHT and HAVERS have a very interesting, but rather dubious theory about the remarkable variations of the initial consonant in the Greek words for 'darkness': *δνόφος*, *γνόφος*, *ζόφος*, *κνέφος*, *ψέφος*, *φέφος*. According to SPECHT this shows an attempt to deprive the frightening and dangerous thing of its power by altering the first letters of its name: "Es liegt also darin eine Art Sprachzauber vor" (cf. HAVERS pp. 177 f.). SPECHT applies a similar explanation to the peculiar consonantism in *vesper*, *ἔσπερο*; on the one side and the corresponding Balto-Slavic words (Lith. *vākara*s, etc.) on the other. On some similar hypotheses of VENDRYES see JESPERSEN, op. cit. p. 183. Another strange phenomenon is the semantic difference between Gk. *φayός*, *φηγός* 'oak' and Latin *fagus*, Goth. *bōka* 'beech' (likewise Illyr. and Maced. **grabu-* 'oak', but originally 'beech'). The explanation, according to SPECHT, is that *φayός* was purely a substitute or noa-word for 'oak'. The oak was taboo to Indo-Europeans as being the seat of the thunder-god; anyone who named the tree and therefore the god by his real name, would run the risk of being struck by the thunderbolt (KZ LXVI, p. 57; HAVERS 180). A more convincing account is given by ERNOUT-MEILLET and WALDE-HOFMANN s. v. *fagus*.

³ A number of remarkable and interesting names of beasts which seem to be connected with notions of taboo can be found in NYROP, pp. 144 f. and especially in HAVERS, pp. 34 ff. The true method of attack is brilliantly exemplified in MEILLET's short study 'Interdictions de vocabulaire' (originally published 1906; now printed in his Ling. hist. I, pp. 281 ff.). The examples are numerous and diverse. In northern and eastern Europe, where bears were an object of fear, the old IE name represented by Greek *ἄρκτος*, Latin *ursus*, etc. was abandoned in favour of circumlocutions such as Eng. *bear*, Germ. *Bär*, Scandin. *björn*, which originally meant 'brown'; in Russian the bear is called *medved* 'honey-eater'. Cf. also NIEDERMANN, Gnomon III, p. 354; VON WARTBURG, Einführung, p. 160. In Graubünden we find the word *salvamur* (*salvo honore*) meaning 'pig', MEYER-LÜBKE, Einführung, p. 109. In this last case I feel that rustic humour played a part that is frequently overlooked; but certainly a large number of secondary beast-names must have arisen from considerations of taboo.

in order to touch upon one class of expressions, the immense number, both in ancient and modern times, both in slang and the higher literary style, of words meaning 'die', 'death': *der Verschiedene, der Entschlafene, the deceased, the departed, the absent ones*, etc. etc. (JESPERSEN lists 18 expressions of this class from English slang alone). The tendency is naturally very old indeed. On the IE stem represented by Latin *mors, morior* WACKERNAGEL remarks (Vorles. II, 286): "Abgesehen von βροτός ἄμβροτος haben die Griechen, im Unterschiede von den Lateinern, die alte auf Tod und Sterben gehende Wort-sippe fallen gelassen, gewiss aus Scheu, die Sache beim Namen zu nennen. In bezug auf das Verbum gehen hierin die Germanen und Kelten mit ihnen zusammen, und bezeichnenderweise haben die Zoroastrier das ererbte Verbum nur auf böse Wesen angewandt, für das Sterben der Frommen ein Verbum des Gehens gebraucht." Among the Latin euphemisms for 'to die' *dormire* may be mentioned, which, as O. HEY demonstrates (Euphemismus und Verwandtes im Lateinischen, ALL XI, p. 523), seems to be used exclusively of Christians; cf. Thes. L. Lat. V:1, 2030, 65 ff. on sepulchral inscriptions, where it is very frequent. It may be modelled on κοιμᾶσθαι, as HEY suggests, and popularized through its use in the New Testament (the raising of Jairus' daughter, etc.).¹

Very often taboo only gives rise to what used to be called a euphemism (so with the many circumlocutions for 'die').² Sometimes the euphemistic tendency goes so far that a harsh, brutal, or ill-boding expression is replaced by its direct contrary, *per antiphrasin* as the old grammarians called it. This sort of formation seems to run counter to all normal logic, but can be explained in psychological terms; and it is by no means uncommon, especially on the primitive levels of culture. It is well known that the Greeks called epilepsy *ἰερή νόσος*, the Romans *sacra passio* — perhaps a pure translation; and whatever original meaning be assigned to *ἱερός* or *sacer*,³ certainly in historic times *sacra passio* was understood as a half-religious euphemism (Theod. Prisc. II, 47; HEY, ALL XI, p. 520). More solid examples of nomenclature *per antiphrasin* occur in various quarters, as Mod. Gk. *καλοτύχη* 'good fate' meaning the plague. Likewise in Arabic (references in HAVERS 99) leprosy is referred to as 'the blessed sickness', and a lunatic is spoken of as 'a blessed one'; a man who

¹ Material also in DIEHL, Inscr. Lat. Chr. Vet. III 518.

² On euphemisms in general see also E. GAMILLSCHEG, *Französische Bedeutungslehre* (1951), pp. 125 ff.

³ Cf., e. g., WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I, p. 22; M. P. NILSSON, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* I, pp. 61 f.

has been bitten by a snake is called 'a sound' or 'safe man', and a blind man is sometimes called *baṣīr* 'he who has sharp eyes'. Similar expressions in ancient and modern Hebrew are quoted by A. FISCHER in *Zeitschr. d. Deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellsch.* LXI, p. 433, note.¹ I hardly need mention the Greek *Εὐμενίδες* as a name for the Erinnyes; Latin *manes* has been debated (cf. WALDE-HOFMANN s. v.), but seems to allow of a similar explanation (ERNOUT-MEILLET).²

In Egyptian GRAPOW (see HAVERS, p. 187) has drawn attention to the remarkable use of 'life' to mean 'death'. No parallel to this seems to have been noticed, but there is in fact an exactly similar case in Latin: *vitālia* 'shroud' instead of *mortuālia*, and *lectus vitalis* 'death-bed', 'bier'. Cf. Petronius 42,6 *bene elatus est, vitali lecto, stragulis bonis*; 77,7 *profer vitālia, in quibus volo me efferrī*; Seneca, Ep. 99,22 *quam multis . . . funus locatur, quam multis vitālia emuntur*. "Mit einem ähnlichen Euphemismus nannten die collegia funeraticia sich *salutaria*" (FRIEDLÄNDER on Petr. 42).³

Other examples of this kind are to be found in Latin both in the early period and in the transition to the Romance languages. The name of Beneventum, a city of political and military importance in southern Samnium, is well enough known. Originally a Hirpine town, it was called *Maleventum* or *Maluentum* (Liv. IX 27,14; Festus p. 31,18 LINDSAY), but when a Roman colony was established there in 268 B.C. the name was changed to *Beneventum* "melioris ominis causa," as Festus puts it. According to some scholars *Maluentum* or *Maleventum*

¹ Further material in GRÜNBAUM, *ibid.* XXXI, pp. 264 f.; 336.

² Similarly BENVENISTE in his interesting study 'Euphémismes anciens et modernes' (*Die Sprache* I, pp. 119 f.) explains *mane* 'morning', 'in the morning', 'early'. After drawing a good analogy from the Berber language, he continues: "Le matin est en effet le moment dangereux où, au sortir de la nuit, se décide le sort, faste ou néfaste, de la journée. De cette croyance doit dériver l'expression latine *māne* où l'on peut maintenant reconnaître le même euphémisme que dans l'adjectif *mānis* appliqué aux esprits des morts, aux *mānēs*. De même que ces esprits redoutables sont propitiés par leur nom de 'bons', de même on veut rendre favorable le début de la matinée en le qualifiant de 'bonne heure', ou *māne*. Nous avons ici un nouvel exemple du procédé connu par gr. *Εὐμενίδες*."

³ Lucretius III 820 hardly belongs here; cf. GUISSANI, HEINZE, and BAILEY ad loc. — Comparable, but more moving and profound, is the practice of the early church in referring to a martyr's day as his *natalis*, cf. Aug., Serm. 310,1 *quod nomen sic frequentat ecclesia, id est natalis, ut natalis vocet pretiosas martyrum mortes*. But this is a more conscious usage: only by temporal death could the martyr be born to eternal life; cf. CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, *Vig. Christ.* I, p. 10.

is to be derived from *Μαλόμεντα*, acc. *Μαλόμεντα* 'apple orchard', so that we should have here what has been called a 'Fehleuphemismus', i. e. a euphemism arising from a misunderstanding. Certainly there is such an example in the following case. Latin *malacia* signifies the calm when winds have ceased to blow, e. g., Caesar B. G. III 15,3 *tanta malacia ac tranquillitas*. It is of course nothing more nor less than the Greek *μαλακία* 'softness', 'mildness' from *μαλακός*. But in very late Vulgar Latin, when the etymology had long been lost to sight, *malacia* was ignorantly associated with *malus*; thus, since the name seemed odd and unsuitable, the form **bonacia* was devised in its place. It is this word which has given rise directly or indirectly to the Romance cognates: It. *bonaccia*,¹ Fr. *bonace*, Sp. *bonanza*, even to Mod. Gr. *μπουνάτσα*. On the other hand there seems to be no trace of *malacia* preserved in Romance languages (MEYER-LÜBKE, ALL VII, p. 445; REW 5254; P. HØYBYE in: In memoriam Kr. Sandfeld, Copenhagen 1943, p. 97).

We have seen what remarkable circumlocutions for diseases and disabilities — at least the more serious ones — occur in the most diverse languages. Perhaps the most frightening of all disabilities is blindness, which in many cases people have shrunk from naming directly. In Arabic, as we have seen, a word meaning 'keensighted' is used to betoken a blind man. A less far-fetched substitute is found in Latin. In the classical period the words *orbis* and *orbare* were only used in reference to one who had been bereft of kin: *filio orbatus*, *pueri parentibus orbi*, etc. But at a later period we find the word used absolutely in reference to blindness, the loss of sight being considered the loss par excellence. Thus Apuleius Met. 5,9 speaking of Fortune as blind and cruel, says: *en orba et saeva et iniqua Fortuna*. Cf. also Juris anteiustin. fragm. Vat. 130 *sive ... quis arthriticus sit ... sive epilepticus sive orbis et his similia*; Venant. Fort. Vita Radeg. 27,65 *caecitas fugit, lux rediit et ... orba e diu dies inluxit*. The verb *orbare* acquires the same connotation, e. g., Ps.—Cypr. De pasch. comp. 11 *filios eius (sc. Sedeciae) ante oculos ipsius interfecit, et sic ipsum Sedeciam orbavit et vinctum eum in Babyloniam duci iussit*.² Isidore (Etym. X 200) has an interesting note: *orbis, quod liberos non habet, quasi oculis amissis*. This psychological explanation of the classical usage

¹ MEYER-LÜBKE (ALL l. c.) says that this form occurs in Dante and later. In fact it is found much earlier; cf., e. g., Regesta Neapolitana 104 (CAPASSO, Monumenta II:1, p. 79) *usque quo faciat* (Ital. *fa!*) *bonaccia*. This document is from A.D. 959.

² The meaning of *orbavit* is shown in the quotation from the Bible which follows.

on the basis of the post-classical serves to show how widespread that usage had become (cf. also Paul. Fest. 195,9 LINDSAY).¹

While it did not entirely drive out *caecus*, *orbis* nevertheless established itself in many of the Romance languages; cf. It. *orbo*, Rum. *orb*, O. Fr. *orb*, Prov. *orþ*, etc. On the causes of this development VON WARTBURG² remarks: "Gegenüber *caecus* hat es den Vorteil der Sinnfälligkeit: *orbis* ist ein Ausdruck, der ein Bild enthält und daher kräftiger wirkt und im Volke beliebter wird." I cannot be sure that this explanation is the right one: I should prefer to reckon *orbis* as a circumlocution for the more brutal and direct word, as a substitute or noa-word arising from taboo or indeed, as JABERG (HA CXXXVI, 1917, p. 106, n. 2) puts it, a euphemism borrowed from an artificial high style.³

The name of euphemism may certainly be given to a usage which has not hitherto been noticed, that of *punire* in the sense of 'punish capitally', *morte multare*. Cassius Parmensis, according to Valerius Maximus 1,7,7, suffered *supplicium capitis, quo eum Caesar adfecit*. But in Nepotian, who made an epitome of Valerius probably in the fourth or fifth century, we find in the corresponding passage (c. 8,5; p. 603,10 KEMPF); *paucis post diebus iussu Caesaris punitus est*. Some critics, with an eye to the original text, have wanted to read *capite punitus est*, but a number of similar examples⁴ prove that there is no need to change the text. In the so-called Liber de viris illustribus c. 40,4 (death of Regulus) we find: *in arcam ligneam coniectus clavis introrsum adactis vigiliis ac dolore punitus est* (where WÖLFFLIN proposed *peremptus est*); similarly Commodian, Apologeticum 827 sq.: *dicimus hunc autem*

¹ Further material in Syntactica II, pp. 374 ff.; S. BLOMGREN, *Studia Fortunatiana* (Diss. Uppsala 1933), p. 186; one medieval example in Adémar de Chabannes, Chron. III 4 (p. 114 CHAVANON); another in DU CANGE s. v. *orbare*.

² V. VON WARTBURG, *Die Ausdrücke für die Fehler des Gesichtorgans in den romanischen Sprachen und Dialekten*, Züricher Diss., Hamburg 1912, § 26 (with further details on the spread of both words in the Romance languages). — On Lat. *ab oculis*, Fr. *aveugle*, Old It. (a)vocolo, etc. see above p. 101.

³ It is difficult to say whether the early example from Apuleius belongs to popular usage or not; cf. Syntactica II, p. 376. The style of Apuleius includes certain indisputable vulgarisms, but the chapter in question is exceedingly literary and precious. For this reason I find JABERG's judgment convincing.

⁴ Cf. HERAEUS, *Philologus* LIX, p. 437. But some of his examples could be interpreted differently.

*Neronem esse vetustum / qui Petrum ac Paulum prius p u n i v i t in urbe.*¹ It is interesting to compare two passages in the Scriptores Hist. Augustae describing exactly the same episode in the life of Marcus Aurelius: Julius Capitolinus says in his Vita M. Ant. Phil. 25,7: *eos etiam, qui deportati fuerant, revocari iussit, cum paucissimi centuriones capite essent p u n i t i*; but Vulc. Gallicanus, Avid. Cass. 8,8 contents himself with: *denique paucissimis centurionibus p u n i t i s deportatos revocari iussit*. Finally this meaning is expressly attested in the so-called Reichenau Glossary (Gloss. Bibl. Augiense)² 2683 *punio : interficio*; cf. CGL IV, 102,49 *iugulare : punire*; IV, 276,8 *puniatur : occidatur*.

How old is this remarkable usage? So far as my knowledge extends, it occurs first in Pliny the Younger, in the refined and literary language of his letters. But the particular circumstances are interesting. In Ep. VIII 14,19 we read: *cum alter p u n i e n d o s, alter censeat relegandos*. The emendation *perdendos* has been proposed, and is accepted by KUKULA, but it is disproved by the expression in the same letter § 21 *eos qui p u n i u n t et qui relegant* (where BUDÆUS wished to insert *morte* before *puniunt*). But immediately before this sentence we find *si dividantur sententiae interficientis et relegantis*; cf. further § 23 *eo qui relegat, illi qui p u n i u n t capite*; likewise above § 12 *alius in insulam relegandos, alius morte p u n i e n d o s arbitrabatur*; § 13 *et qui morte p u n i e b a n t et qui relegabant* (a little earlier: *quid enim commune habet occidere et relegare*). Other variants also occur, as § 17 *uni placuisse perire liberos, alteri relegari*. The euphemistic understatement *punire* for *morte (capite) punire* occurs thus in Pliny the Younger, one of the most cultivated men of the early imperial period, but only, let it be said, where the context makes the meaning clear, and for the sake of *variatio sermonis*.

Equally illuminating is the semantic development of the colourless *animadvertere*. In the classical period it is used to mean 'punish', but in Late Latin it comes to mean 'punish by death'. In the Thes. L. Lat. only a few examples

¹ To this class also belongs Historia Apollonii 44 (p. 98,12 RIESE), where it is not a matter simply of punishing, but of putting to death. — On the other hand the reading in Quint. Decl. min. 270 (p. 106,26 RITTER) *ipsa sua manu vitam misera p u n i v i t* is quite intolerable and must be wrong. This is presumably the passage that SCHUSTER has in mind in his note on Plin. Ep. 8,14,19. RITTER prints *finivit*, which is probably right (SCHULTING *finierit*).

² The latest edition is that of A. LABHARDT, Neuchâtel 1948. In his opinion the glossary was composed at the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century.

are given from the Digests, Cyprian, and a rather uncertain example from the elder Seneca; cf., e. g., Paulus, Dig. 48,24,3 *corpora animadversorum quibuslibet petentibus ad sepulturam danda sunt*. But the same usage is certainly found in Tacitus (Germ. 7,2) and Frontinus.¹ Naturally this euphemism also is rooted in the universal taboo associated with death, but it is principally of interest that here, as with *punire* 'put to death', we are not dealing with what would normally be called primitive notions. The semantic development in question was a very slow one, and we first observe it on a relatively high cultural level.²

In this connexion we may well pay some attention to a couple of words signifying 'kill'; their development in Late Latin and Romance times has been much discussed without any certain conclusion being reached as to various details. In these we shall again meet, as it seems, tabooistic tendencies side by side with other more or less primitive features.

It may be considered etymologically certain that the French verb *tuer* 'to kill' is derived from the Latin *tutare*, a late byform of the deponent *tutari* 'to protect'. The change of meaning is quite startling and cries out for an explanation. In view of classical usage one feels tempted to suppose a *tutare* (*tutari*) *aliquem* 'to defend oneself against someone', on the analogy of *defendere aliquem* meaning the same thing. But the analogy is only a seeming analogy, since the original meaning of *defendere* is 'knock away', 'repel', and the phrase *defendere hostem* is therefore entirely natural. Furthermore — and this is to my mind decisive — neither Classical nor Late Latin supplies any example of *tutari aliquem* in the sense required.³ There are however three examples of *tutari rem* which deserve attention: Sall. Hist., Or. Lepidi 1 *in tutandis periculis* (*vitandis* has been proposed); Caes. B. Civ. 1,52,4 *praesentem inopiam quibus poterat subsidiis tutabatur*; Calpurn. Ecl. 4,27 *quo tute re famem*.⁴ The two latter examples seem to me rather to point to a meaning 'mitigate', 'lessen' (cf. Calpurn. just afterwards v. 32 *famem solarer hibisco*).

¹ G. BENDZ, Die Echtheitsfrage des vierten Buches der Frontinschen Strategemata, Diss. Lund 1938, pp. 162 f.

² Cf. also R. HEINZE's interesting study on the notion *supplicium*, ALL XV, pp. 89 ff. He mentions among other things that "später der Magistrat die zum Tode Verurteilten *duci iubebat*" (MOMMSEN, Strafrecht, p. 924, note 1).

³ At least I know of no example of it, and the Thes. L. Lat. Bureau cannot supply one.

⁴ HAVERS 75 remarks: "Den ursprünglichen Sinn dieser Stelle fasst man, wenn man davon ausgeht, dass es für die primitive Mentalität auch einen Dämon des Hungers und des Durstes gibt, der beruhigt und beschwichtigt werden muss." This is no doubt very true in itself, but it has little relevance to so refined and literary a poet as Calpurnius.

This usage helps us to understand some interesting expressions in Ecclesiastical Latin of the early Middle Ages, where we find *tutare* in the sense 'extinguish' (a lamp, etc.), properly 'bring to rest'. The material has been collected and analysed most ably by HAVERS, pp. 76 ff.;¹ it is only surprising that earlier examples have not been found. The earliest case of this kind occurs in the so-called *Regula Magistri* (seventh or possibly sixth century);² cf. esp. c. 29 (MIGNE, PL 88, 999 B-C) *in quo atrio pendeat cicindelus, qui ... ab hebdomadariis ad seram ante completorios incendatur, ut videant diversi quomodo se collocent; et postquam se omnes percollocaverint, a supradictis tutetur, si forte indigentia olei in monasterio sentiatur*; cf. also *ibid.* 19 (987 B). The same meaning occurs several times in the liturgical *Ordo Romanus* (probably saec. IX); cf. 1, 33 (MIGNE 78, 953 A-B) *Deinde sequitur matutinum. Lucernae extinguuntur. Luminaria autem ecclesiae ab initio cantus nocturni inchoantur extingui, hoc tamen ordine, ut ab introitu ipsius ecclesiae incipiat paulatim tutare*³ ... *In initio psalmi primi sit custos semper paratus in loco dexterarum partis ecclesiae prope lampadibus, ut ubi audierit Antiphonam, tenens cannam in manu sua tutat lampadam unam. In finem psalmi ipsius aliam sinistram partis; sic una ex parte una, alia ex alia tutantur, usque ad Evangelium. In Evangelio vero tutatur mediana lampada*;⁴ similarly in the Appendix, *ibid.* 959 D and 960 C; cf. also Alcuin, *De divinis officiis*, c. 16 f. (MIGNE, PL 101, 1203 C) *in initio primi psalmi est custos paratus ... et mox ut primam Antiphonam audierit, exstinguit primam lucernam. In fine vero sequentis psalmi ex parte sinistra tutat aliam, in medio tertiam*. This construction obviously is closely connected with the Italian *attutare*, *attutire* 'to quieten', 'bring to rest', which according to MEYER-LÜBKE (ZRPh XXXII, p. 497) means in many Italian dialects 'put out' (a fire, etc.). An analogy is presented by the Spanish *apagar* (*ad* + *pacare*), on which JUD in a valuable paper (*Rev. de ling. romane* I, p. 188) remarks that "toute la péninsule ibérique ne connaît guère d'autre verbe pour exprimer l'idée de s'éteindre."

¹ He also gives references to earlier treatments of the problem (MEYER-LÜBKE, JUD, LERCH, and others).

² According to F. VANDENBROUCKE, *Revue Bénédictine* LXII (1952), p. 271, it probably dates from between 555 and 575; earlier scholars assigned it to the seventh century.

³ The gloss here says: *id est exstinguere*.

⁴ Cf. HAVERS 77, note 2: "An allen drei Tagen der Karwoche wird das Brevier gemeinsam in der Kirche gebetet, wobei 15 Kerzen angezündet werden und nach jedem Psalm wird eine Kerze ausgelöscht."

Perhaps the most interesting part of the problem, at least from the standpoint of Latin, and a question which remains as yet unsolved, is the following: Is *tutare* = 'to extinguish' a specifically Christian and ecclesiastical meaning, or did it belong to the general stock of Vulgar Latin? HAVERS (76, note) thinks that this *tutare* existed in popular language "schon vor der christlichen Zeit." This dating is certainly too early for the evidence; the basic question is whether the usage was of popular or of ecclesiastical origin; and to this we cannot yet give a safe answer.¹ We know far too little of late Vulgar Latin, especially of the language of the seventh and eighth centuries, and in addition the texts are often accessible only in antiquated or untrustworthy editions.

As for the French *tuer* 'kill', it seems to show a semantic development peculiar to France, attested from the twelfth century onwards. It has been the subject of a detailed study by NYROP, 'Le verbe tuer'.² He compares for example *apaiser* 'quieten', 'calm', which in French thieves' slang means 'kill', Old Norse *slökkva* 'extinguish', Swedish *stilla, tysta*, meaning in slang 'to kill', German *er hatte ihn stille gemacht*, all being euphemistic circumlocutions for the same notion.

A problem which opens wider perspectives is that which concerns the Latin *necare*. To differentiate precisely between the meaning of this verb and its synonyms *interficere*, *interimere*, *occidere*, etc. is impossible; but to a large extent WÖLFFLIN (ALL VII, p. 278) is right in his contention that at least in the post-classical period *necare* is especially applied to killing without the use of weapons. Thus we often find *fame necare*, *veneno necare*, etc.,³ although there are many places where it simply conveys the general notion of causing death. But it is very remarkable that the Romance derivatives of *necare* and

¹ From the general and psychological viewpoint it is important to remember that throughout primitive folk-beliefs and languages we meet the notion of fire as something living and sacred, and therefore the notion of quenching was conveyed for preference by some euphemistic expression. BENVENISTE (op. cit. above p. 185, note 2) adduces some Iranian parallels to the material assembled by HAVERS and JUD, and remarks: "Tout cela va dans le même sens que lat. *ignem tutare* qui est bien à entendre 'calmer, apaiser (le feu)' et qui confirme l'origine euphémistique de fr. *tuer*" (p. 122). Cf. also CHANTRAINE, Les verbes grecs significant "tuer" (ibid. 143 ff.). Thus it seems not impossible that the ecclesiastical usage in question should have had its roots in primitive folk-beliefs.

² KR. NYROP, Linguistique et histoire des mœurs. Mélanges posthumes. Trad. par E. Philipot, Paris 1934, pp. 274 ff.

³ Cf., e. g., Suet. Tib. 54,2; Nero 36,2; 43,1; Galba 9,1; *enecare* Cal. 49,3. The situation is the same as regards the one passage where Virgil uses *necare*, Aen. VIII 488.

enecare mean generally 'to drown'; so Prov. *negar*, Fr. *noyer*, It. *annegare*, Sp. and Port. *anegar*, etc. (see the dictionaries of MEYER-LÜBKE and DIEZ). This more specialized use appears already in Late Latin and in early Medieval Latin, as WÖLFFLIN l. c. and BONNET p. 286 briefly observe (more detailed treatment can be found in a wellknown paper by WILHELM SCHULZE¹). Thus we find in Gregory of Tours, Hist. Franc. VI 35 *alias* (sc. *maleficas*) *enecat*, *alias incendio tradit*; similarly Glor. mart. 104 *nonnulli in flumine Garonnae necati*; cf. BONNET l. c.²

At a rather later period (seventh century) we find such typical examples as the following from Fredegarius 3,19 (p. 100,28) *genitorem . . . trucidasti, matrem eius, lapidem ad collo legata, negare* (i. e. *necare*) *iussisti*. Another instructive example is Reichenau Gloss. 524, where *submersi* in Exod. 15,4 (*submersi sunt in mari rubro*) is thus glossed: *submersi : dimersi* (i. e. *demersi*), *necati*. Other examples are given by SCHULZE, pp. 154 f., e. g., Vita Anscarii 40 *ut gladio trucidaretur aut igne cremaretur aut in aqua necaretur*; Annals of Hildesheim A.D. 990 *hoc anno Saxones Abotritos bis grandi irruptione vastabant; multi quoque illorum . . . interempti sunt, alii in flumine necati*; cf. also Leges Alamann., p. 144,8 f. (LEHMANN).³ Such examples could easily be multiplied, as, e. g., Annales regni Francorum A.D. 788 (SS. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum ex MGH separatim editi, 1895, p. 84): *multa stragia ibidem facta est occidendo, et alii in Danubio fluvio vitam necando emisunt*.

The intermediate stage in this semantic development, as SCHULZE points out, must be *necare* = 'to choke', which perhaps occurs in Tacitus⁴ Ann. 12,47 *non ferrum, non venenum in sororem et patrum expromit, sed proiectos in humum et veste multa gravique opertos necat. Filii quoque Mithridatis, quod caedibus parentum illacrimaverant, trucidati sunt*; cf. at a late period Lex Burgund., lib. const. 34,1 *si qua mulier maritum suum, cui legitime est iuncta, dimiserit, necetur in luto*. The connexion between the meanings 'choke' and 'drown' emerges clearly in those passages where *necare* corresponds to Gk. *πνίγειν*. A number of hitherto unnoticed cases of

¹ Beiträge zur Wort- und Sittengeschichte (originally in Sitz.-Ber. der Berliner-akademie 1918; now in his 'Kleine Schriften', pp. 148 ff.).

² Side by side with this usage Gregory has *fame*, *veneno*, and *variis cruciatibus necare*, etc.

³ MGH, Leg. sect. I, 5:1.

⁴ Possibly even in a passage of Ovid; cf. SCHULZE 157.

this kind can be found in Anastasius' translation of the Chronicon of Theophanes Confessor (saec. IX),¹ e. g., p. 79,26 *ita ut amnis necatis equis cum ascensoribus impleretur* (Theoph. has πεπνιγμένοις); 143,13 *multi necati sunt in aquis* (ἐπνίγησαν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι); 173,30 *hosque vertentes ad stagnum ... multos necaverunt ex illis* (ἀπέπνιξαν); 182,33 *multos ex eis detruncavit, quosdam vero decollavit, nonnullos autem in saccos missos mari necavit* (ἀπέπνιξεν); 233,14 f. *multos Arabum interfecit* (ἀπέκτεινε) *sed et ipsum Chaganum ... in amne necavit* (ποταμόπνικτον ἐποίει).²

Thus we can answer fairly confidently the question: How did this semantic development occur between Classical Latin and the Romance period? But philologists hitherto have seldom seriously asked themselves why the development should have occurred. In order that *necare* should become restricted in its use to death by drowning — the dominating use in Romance language — it is necessary that for the unlettered multitude in the late Empire and early Middle Ages drowning, death by water, should have been the death of all deaths, death par excellence.³ This point was first made by IMMISCH (Rh. Mus. LXXX, pp. 98 ff.), who also gave the true explanation: it was felt that the souls of those who had suffered drowning were hindered from leaving the body with the last breath, and therefore perished with it. He cites an interesting piece of testimony to this view. Bishop Synesius (saec. IV–V) in his fourth letter⁴ refers to a great storm at sea, which he himself witnessed. Among the passengers on his ship were a detachment of soldiers, and when the destruction of the vessel was expected at any moment, he saw the soldiers draw their swords. When he asked the reason, one of them replied that they preferred to die on deck and let their souls escape upon the air rather than be drowned in the waves: πρὸς τὸν ἀέρα τὴν ψυχὴν ἐρυγεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς κύμα χανόντας. So, says IMMISCH, in the moment of peril they preferred to die by their own swords

¹ Theophanis Chronographia, rec. C. DE BOOR, I–II, Lipsiae 1883–85.

² On the other hand the Vulgate, Marc. 5,13 represents the Greek ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ by *suffocati sunt in mari*. SCHULZE 153 considers that the use of Latin *necare* very probably developed under the influence of Greek πνίγειν, but this seems to me very uncertain. He is certainly right, however, in his contention that at a late date there was a certain "Ausgleichung zwischen Griechisch und Lateinisch" in this connexion as in so many others (cf. above, pp. 110 ff.). It is well known that πνίγειν in later Greek also had the meaning 'drown'.

³ Another interesting example of specialization and narrowing of meaning is the English *starve*, originally 'die', like the German *sterben*.

⁴ Epistolographi Graeci, rec. R. HERCHER (Paris 1873), p. 642.

rather than by drowning. The learned bishop refers to some passages of Homer, which in his opinion show that Homer considered τὸν καθ' ὕδατος θάνατον ὁλεθρὸν εἶναι καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ψυχῆς, and that therefore he reckoned death by drowning to be ἀκριβεστάτην ἀπώλειαν, complete annihilation.¹

Further testimony to this undoubtedly wide-spread notion would be very welcome.² In such cases the philologist requires the assistance of the ethnologist and the folklorist, as indeed it is only through collaboration with other branches of learning and by "comparative research in human culture" in the widest sense that light can be thrown upon the development of the human race and the ways of life and thought of generations that have passed away.

¹ The passages from other ancient authors adduced by IMMISCH do not to me seem to bear out his contention.

² A similar notion has probably lain behind the barbarian punishment of *necare in luto* (above p. 192) which is well known among the Germanic peoples; cf. Tacitus Germ. 12; J. GRIMM, Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer, 4. Aufl., II, pp. 276 f. But other motives must also be taken into account in this connexion; cf. Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens, ed. by HOFFMANN-KRAYER, VIII, p. 603 and especially FOLKE STRÖM, On the sacral origin of the Germanic death penalties (Kungl. Vitterhets, Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar LII, Stockholm 1942), pp. 171 ff.; 178 ff. The notion referred to by IMMISCH probably deserves more attention than it has hitherto received.

LITERATURE

- ACO = Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum iussu atque mandato Societatis scientiarum Argentoratensis ed. EDUARDUS SCHWARTZ I—, Berlin 1914—.
- ALL = Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, herausgegeben von E. WÖLFFLIN I—XV, Leipzig 1884—1908.
- ALMA = Bulletin Du Cange. Archivum latinitatis medii aevi, Paris—Bruxelles 1924—.
- Anal. Boll. = Analecta Bollandiana, Bruxelles 1882—.
- ARNALDI = Latinitatis Italicae medii aevi inde ab a. CDLXXVI usque ad a. MXXII lexicon imperfectum cura et studio FRANCISCI ARNALDI, ALMA X (*a — gradior*), XII 65—152 (*gradior — medicamen*), XX 65—206 (*medicacio — ozimum*), XXI 193—360 (*pabo — pyxis*), XXIII 275—301 (*qrite — quum*).
- BARTAL = ANTONIUS BARTAL, Glossarium mediæ et infimæ latinitatis regni Hungariæ, Leipzig 1901.
- BASTARDAS PARERA = JUAN BASTARDAS PARERA, Particularidades sintacticas del latin medieval (Cartularios españoles de los siglos VIII al XI), Barcelona 1953 (Publicaciones de la Escuela de filologia de Barcelona. Filologia Clasica, vol. XII).
- BATTISTI, Avviamento = CARLO BATTISTI, Avviamento allo studio del latino volgare, Bari 1949.
- BAUER see PREUSCHEN-BAUER.
- BAXTER-JOHNSON = J. H. BAXTER and CHARLES JOHNSON, Medieval Latin word-list from British and Irish sources, Oxford 1934.
- BEHAGHEL = OTTO BEHAGHEL, Deutsche Syntax I—IV, Heidelberg 1923—1932.
- BENNETT = CHARLES E. BENNETT, Syntax of Early Latin I—II, Boston 1910—1914.
- BLASS-DEBRUNNER = FRIEDRICH BLASS, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. 6. durchges. und verm. Aufl. bearb. von ALBERT DEBRUNNER, Göttingen 1931.
- BLATT = FRANZ BLATT, Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos mit sprachlichem Kommentar herausgegeben, Diss., Giessen—Kopenhagen 1930 (Zeitschr. f. die neutest. Wissenschaft, Beiheft 12).
- BONNET = M. BONNET, Le latin de Grégoire de Tours, Paris 1890.
- BOURCIEZ = ÉDOUARD BOURCIEZ, Éléments de linguistique romane, 4. éd. rev. par l'auteur et par les soins de JEAN BOURCIEZ, Paris 1946.
- BRENOUS = J. BRENOUS, Étude sur les hellénismes dans la syntaxe latine, Thèse, Paris 1895.
- BRUGMANN-THUMB = KARL BRUGMANN, Griechische Grammatik, 4. Aufl. bearb. von ALBERT THUMB, München 1913 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II, 1).

BÜCHELER, CE = *Anthologia Latina sive poesis Latinae supplementum*, edd. F. BÜCHELER et A. RIESE. Pars posterior: *Carmina epigraphica I—II*, Leipzig 1895—1897.
 BURSIAŃ'S Jahresber. = *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Begründet von CONRAD BURSIAŃ. Berlin—Leipzig 1873—.

CAPASSO = *Monumenta ad Neapolitani Ducatus historiam pertinentia* ed. B. CAPASSO, Napoli 1881—1892.

CGL = *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum I—VII*, a GUSTAVO LOEWE inchoatum. Rec. GEORGIUS GOETZ, Leipzig 1888—1903.

CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum consilium et auctoritate Academiae litterarum R. Borussicae editum*, Berlin 1863—.

Cod. Dipl. Long. = *Codice Diplomatico Longobardo I—II*, ed. L. SCHIAPARELLI, Roma 1929—1933 (Fonti 62—63).

CSEL = *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, Wien 1866—.

DELBRÜCK = BERTHOLD DELBRÜCK, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen I—III*, Strassburg 1893—1900 (= vols. III—V of the first edition of BRUGMANN-DELBRÜCK, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg 1886—.)

DESSAU = *Inscriptiones latinae selectae I—III*, ed. HERMANNUS DESSAU, Berlin 1892—1916.

DEVOTO = GIACOMO DEVOTO, *Storia della lingua di Roma*, Bologna 1940 (*Storia di Roma* XXIII).

DIEHL = *Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres I—III*, ed. ERNESTUS DIEHL, Berlin 1924—1931.

DIEZ, Et. Wb. = FRIEDRICH DIEZ, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*, 5. Ausg., Bonn 1887.

— Gramm. = *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen I—III*, 5. Aufl., Bonn 1882.

DU CANGE = CHARLES DU FRESNE dom. DU CANGE, *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ latinitatis I—X*, ed. L. FAVRE, Niort 1883—1887.

— Gloss. Gr. = *Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ græcitatatis I—II*, Lugduni 1688.

ERNOUT-MEILLET = A. ERNOUT et A. MEILLET, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, 3ème éd. revue, corrigée et augmentée d'un index, Paris 1951.

FEW see VON WARTBURG.

Fonti = *Fonti per la storia d'Italia* pubblicate dall'Istituto storico italiano, Roma 1887—.

FORCELLINI = *Totius latinitatis lexicon opera et studio AEGIDII FORCELLINI lucubratum ... novo ordine digestum ... cura et studio VINCENTII DE-VIT I—VI*, Prati 1858—1875.

FREI = HENRI FREI, *La grammaire des fautes*, Paris 1929.

GAMILLSCHEG, Et. Wb. = ERNST GAMILLSCHEG, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache*, Heidelberg 1928 (*Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher* III, 5).

GEORGES = K. E. GEORGES, Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch I—II, 8. verb. und verm. Aufl., Hannover—Leipzig 1913—1918.

GERCKE-NORDEN, Einleitung = Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft, hg. von ALFRED GERCKE und EDUARD NORDEN, Leipzig—Berlin 1³ 1927; II² 1912; III 1912.

GODEFROY = F. GODEFROY, Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française I—X, Paris 1881—1902.

GOELZER = H. GOELZER, Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de Saint Jérôme, Thèse, Paris 1884.

GRAFF = E. G. GRAFF, Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz I—VI, Berlin 1834—1842.

GRANDGENT = C. H. GRANDGENT, An introduction to Vulgar Latin, Boston 1907.

— From Latin to Italian. An historical outline of the phonology and morphology of the Italian language, Cambr. Mass. 1926.

GrL = Grammatici latini ex recensione HENRICI KEILII I—VII, Leipzig 1857—1880.

HA = Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen. Begründet von LUDWIG HERRIG. 1846—.

HAMMARSTRÖM, Glossarium = M. HAMMARSTRÖM, Glossarium till Finlands och Sveriges latinska medeltidsurkunder jämte språklig inledning, Helsingfors 1925 (Handböcker utgivna av Finska Historiska Samfundet I).

HAVERS, Handbuch = W. HAVERS, Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax. Ein Versuch zur Erforschung der Bedingungen und Triebkräfte in Syntax und Stilistik, Heidelberg 1931 (Indogerm. Bibl. I, 1, 20).

HEUMANN-SECKEL = HEUMANN'S Handlexikon zu den Quellen des römischen Rechts, 9. Aufl. neu bearb. von E. SECKEL, Jena 1907.

HOFMANN = STOLZ-SCHMALZ, Lateinische Grammatik. In 5. Aufl. völlig neu bearb. von MANU LEUMANN und J. B. HOFMANN, München 1928 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II, 2).

— Umgangssprache = Lateinische Umgangssprache, Heidelberg 1926 (Indogerm. Bibl. I, 1, 17).

HOPPE = HEINRICH HOPPE, Syntax und Stil des Tertullian, Leipzig 1903.

IF = Indogermanische Forschungen, Strassburg (since 1919 Berlin) 1892—.

IG = Inscriptiones graecae consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum R. Borussicae editae I—, Berlin 1873—.

JANNARIS = A. N. JANNARIS, An historical Greek grammar, chiefly on the Attic dialect as written and spoken from classical antiquity down to the present time, London 1897.

JRS = The Journal of Roman Studies, London 1911—.

KAULEN = FRANZ KAULEN, Sprachliches Handbuch zur biblischen Vulgata, Freiburg i. B. 1904.

KOFFMANE = G. KOFFMANE, Geschichte des Kirchenlateins I: 1—2, Breslau 1879—1881.

KROLL, Studien = WILHELM KROLL, Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur, Stuttgart 1924.

KÜHNER-STEGMANN = R. KÜHNER, Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Band: Satzlehre, 2. Aufl. Neubearb. von C. STEGMANN I—II, Hannover 1912—1914.

KZ = Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen. Begründet von A. KUHN. Berlin 1852—.

LERCH = EUGEN LERCH, Historische französische Syntax I—III, Leipzig 1925—1934.

LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES = A Greek-English lexicon compiled by H. G. LIDDELL and ROBERT SCOTT, revised and augmented throughout by H. S. JONES, 9th ed., Oxford 1940.

LINDERBAUER = S. Benedicti Regula Monachorum, hgg. und philologisch erkl. von BENNO LINDERBAUER, Metten 1922.

LINNÉR = STURE LINNÉR, Syntaktische und lexikalische Studien zur Historia Lausiaca des Palladios, Diss., Uppsala 1943 (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1943, 2).

LITTRÉ = ÉMILE LITTRÉ, Dictionnaire de la langue française I—II, Paris 1863—1872.

LJUNGVİK = HERMAN LJUNGVİK, Studien zur Sprache der apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, Diss., Uppsala 1926 (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1926, 8).

LÖFSTEDT, Arnob. = EINAR LÖFSTEDT, Arnobiana. Textkritische und sprachliche Studien zu Arnobius, Lund 1917 (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. Ny Följd, Avd. 1, XII, 5).

— Beitr. = Beiträge zur Kenntnis der späteren Latinität, Diss., Stockholm 1907 (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1907).

— Coniect. = Coniectanea. Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der antiken und mittelalterlichen Latinität. Erste Reihe, Uppsala—Stockholm 1950.

— Peregr. Aeth. = Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae, Uppsala 1911 (unchanged reprint 1936).

— Syntact. = Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins 1²—II, Lund 1942, 1933 (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-samfundet i Lund X, 1—2).

— Verm. Stud. = Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax, Lund 1936 (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund XXIII).

MEILLET, Esquisse = A. MEILLET, Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine, Paris 1928 (3. éd. 1933).

— Ling. hist. = Linguistique historique et linguistique générale I—II, Paris 1921—1936 (Collection linguistique VIII, XL).

MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, Orígenes = RAMÓN MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, Orígenes del Español, 3. ed., Madrid 1950.

MEYER-LÜBKE = WILHELM MEYER-LÜBKE, Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen I—IV, Leipzig 1890—1902.

— Einführung = Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft, 3. Aufl., Heidelberg 1920 (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher I, 1).

— Italienische Grammatik, Leipzig 1890.

— Portius = Simon Portius, Grammatica linguae graecae vulgaris. Reproduction de l'édition de 1638 suivie d'un commentaire grammatical et historique par WILHELM

- MEYER, Paris 1889 (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. Sciences hist. et philol. fasc. 78).
- MEYER-LÜBKE, REW = Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 3. Aufl., Heidelberg 1935 (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher III, 3).
- MGH = Monumenta Germaniae historica.
- AA = Auctorum antiquissimorum tomi I—XV, Berlin 1877—1919.
- Epist. = Epistularum tomi I—VII, Berlin 1887—1925.
- Leg. = Legum tomi I—V, Hannover 1835—1889.
- Leg. sect. = Legum sectiones I—V, Hannover 1881—1924.
- Mer. = Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum. Tomi I—VII, Hannover 1885—1920.
- Lang. = Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI—IX, Hannover 1878.
- Script. = Scriptorum tomi I—XXX, Hannover 1826—1896.
- MIGNE, PL = Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina. Accurante J.-P. MIGNE.
- MOULTON = J. H. MOULTON, Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments. Auf Grund der vom Verf. neu bearb. 3. engl. Aufl. übers. deutsche Ausg., Heidelberg 1911 (Indo-germ. Bibl. I, 1, 9).
- MULLER, Chronol. = H. F. MULLER, A chronology of Vulgar Latin, Halle 1929 (ZRPh, Beiheft 78).
- MØRLAND = HENNING MØRLAND, Die lateinischen Oribasiusübersetzungen, Oslo 1932 (Symbolae Osloenses, fasc. supplet. V).
- NÄGELSBACH-MÜLLER = K. F. VON NÄGELBACHS Lateinische Stilistik, 9. verm. und verb. Aufl. besorgt von IWAN MÜLLER, Nürnberg 1905.
- Neue Jahrb. = Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik, Leipzig 1898—.
- NEUE-WAGENER = FR. NEUE, Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, 3. Aufl. von C. WAGENER I—IV, Leipzig 1892—1905.
- NIEDERMANN, Quellen = MAX NIEDERMANN, Über einige Quellen unserer Kenntnis des späteren Vulgärlateinischen (Neue Jahrb. 29, 1912, 313—342).
- NORBERG, Beitr. = DAG NORBERG, Beiträge zur spätlateinischen Syntax, Uppsala 1944.
- Greg. = In registrum Gregorii Magni studia critica I—II, Uppsala 1937—1939 (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1937, 4; 1939, 7).
- Synt. Forsch. = Syntaktische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete des Spätlateins und des frühen Mittellateins, Uppsala 1943 (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1943, 9).
- NORDEN, Kunstprosa = EDUARD NORDEN, Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance I—II, 4. Abdruck, Leipzig—Berlin 1923.
- NYROP = KR. NYROP, Grammaire historique de langue française, Tome I⁴ Copenhague 1939; II³ 1924; III² 1936; IV 1913; V 1925; VI 1930.
- PAUL, Prinzipien = HERMANN PAUL, Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte, 5. Aufl., Halle 1920.
- PAULY-WISSOWA = PAULYS Real-Enzyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung hg. von G. WISSOWA, Stuttgart 1894—.

- PEI = MARIO A. PEI, The language of the eighth century texts in northern France, Diss., New York 1932.
- Peregr. Aeth. see LÖFSTEDT.
- PL see MIGNE.
- PLANTA = R. VON PLANTA, Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte I—II, Strassburg 1892—1897.
- PREISIGKE = F. PREISIGKE, Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden, Berlin 1924—.
- PREUSCHEN-BAUER = WALTER BAUER, Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Zweite, völlig neu gearbeitete Auflage zu ERWIN PREUSCHENS Vollständigem griechisch-deutschem Handwörterbuch, Giessen 1928.
- RADERMACHER = LUDWIG RADERMACHER, Neutestamentliche Grammatik, 2. erweiterte Aufl., Tübingen 1925.
- REL = Revue des Études Latines, Paris 1923—.
- REW see MEYER-LÜBKE.
- Rh. Mus. = Rheinische Museum für Philologie, Frankfurt a. M. 1833—.
- RÖNSCH = H. RÖNSCH, Itala und Vulgata. Das Sprachidiom der urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata unter Berücksichtigung der römischen Volkssprache, 2. Ausg., Marburg 1875.
- S. B. = Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch I—III, Leipzig 1887—1889.
- ROHLFS, GERHARD, Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten I—II, Bern 1949—1950 (Bibliotheca Romanica. Series prima: Manualia et commentationes V—VI).
- Rom. Phil. = Romanische Philologie I—II, Heidelberg 1950—1952.
- Rom. Forsch. = Romanische Forschungen. Zeitschrift für romanische Sprachen und Literaturen, Erlangen 1883—.
- RPH = Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes, Paris 1845—.
- SALONIUS = A. H. SALONIUS, Vitae Patrum. Kritische Untersuchungen über Text, Syntax und Wortschatz der spätlateinischen Vitae Patrum, Lund 1920 (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund II).
- SANDFELD = KRISTIAN SANDFELD, Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats, Paris 1930 (Collection linguistique XXXI).
- SAS = L. F. SAS, The noun declension system in Merovingian Latin, Diss. Columbia University, Paris 1937.
- SCHULTZ-GORA, OSKAR, Altprovenzalisches Elementarbuch, 3. Aufl., Heidelberg 1915 (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher I, 3).
- SCHWYZER = E. SCHWYZER, Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von KARL BRUGMANNs griech. Gramm. I—III, München 1939—1953 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II, 1: 1—3).
- SMT = Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte 1—10, hg. von ALFONS HILKA, Heidelberg 1911—1929.

SOPHOCLES = E. A. SOPHOCLES, Greek lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine periods. Memorial edition, Cambr. Mass. 1914.

SOUTER = A. SOUTER, A glossary of Later Latin to 600 A. D., Oxford 1949.

SPITZER, LEO, Aufsätze zur romanischen Syntax und Stilistik, Halle 1918.

STRECKER-VAN DE WOESTIJNE = KARL STRECKER, Introduction à l'étude du latin médiéval. Traduite de l'allemand par PAUL VAN DE WOESTIJNE, 3ème éd. revue et augmentée, Lille-Genève 1948 (Société de publications romanes et françaises sous la direction de Mario Roques XXVI).

SVENNUNG, Oros. = J. SVENNUNG, Orosiana. Syntaktische, semasiologische und kritische Studien zu Orosius, Diss., Uppsala 1922 (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1922, 5).

— Untersuch. = Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache, Uppsala 1936.

— Wortstudien = Wortstudien zu den spätlateinischen Oribasiusrezensionen, Uppsala 1932.

Syntact(ica) see LÖFSTEDT.

TARDIF = J. TARDIF, Monuments historiques, cartons des rois (Archives de l'Empire), Paris 1866.

TEEUWEN, Bedeutungswandel = Sr. W. J. TEEUWEN, Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian. Ein Beitrag zum Studium der christlichen Sondersprache, Paderborn 1926 (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums XIV, 1).

Thes. L. Lat. = Thesaurus Linguae Latinae I—, Leipzig 1900—.

TOBLER, Beitr. = ADOLF TOBLER, Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik, 1. Reihe³ Leipzig 1921; 2. Reihe² 1906; 3. Reihe² 1908; 4. Reihe 1908; 5. Reihe 1912.

TOBLER-LOMMATZSCH, Altfr. Wb. = TOBLER-LOMMATZSCH, Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch. ADOLF TOBLERS nachgelassene Materialien bearb. und mit Unterstützung der Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. hgg. von ERHARD LOMMATZSCH I—. Berlin 1925—.

UDDHOLM = ALF UDDHOLM, Formulae Marculfi. Études sur la langue et le style, Uppsala 1954 (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1954, 2).

Verm. Stud. see LÖFSTEDT.

VIELLIARD = JEANNE VIELLIARD, Le latin des diplômes royaux et chartes privées de l'époque mérovingienne, Paris 1927 (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. Sciences hist. et philol. fasc. 251).

Vig. Christ. = Vigiliae Christianae. A review of early Christian life and language, Amsterdam 1947—.

WACKERNAGEL = JACOB WACKERNAGEL, Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch I—II, 2. Aufl., Basel 1926—1928.

WALDE-HOFMANN = A. WALDE, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 3. Neubearb. Aufl. von J. B. HOFMANN I—III, Heidelberg 1935—1956 (Indogerm. Bibl. I, II, 1:1—3).

VON WARTBURG, Einführung = WALTHER VON WARTBURG, Einführung in Problematik und Methodik der Sprachwissenschaft, Halle 1943.

— FEW = Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I—, Bonn 1928—.

WISTRAND = ERIK WISTRAND, *Vitruviusstudier*, Diss., Göteborg 1933.

W. St. = Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie, Wien 1879—.

ZILLIAKUS, Weltsprachen = H. ZILLIAKUS, Zum Kampf der Weltsprachen im ost-römischen Reich, Diss., Helsingfors 1935.

ZRPh = Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Halle 1877—.

INDICES

Index rerum.

Ablative of price with *valere* 20.

Abstracts turned concretes 145—156.

Accusative, petrified 137—138; of respect 94—95.

Adjectives see Substantives.

Aetheria, style and nationality 44—48.

African Latin 42.

Apposition 120—121; inst. of gen. part. 30.

Attraction with *bonus* 19, with *nimius* 19.

Augustinus, Locut. in Hept. libri vii 90—91; sermons 70—71; 155.

Blending, blend see Contamination.

Brachylogy 98—99.

Calques sémantiques see Loan translations.

Capitulare de villis 55.

Christian Latin 68—87; 89—92; 96; 102—105; 124; 147; 184; 191.

Compositiones Lucenses (ad tingenda musiva) 50.

Concretes turned abstracts 144.

Constructio ad sensum 92; 152; 154.

Contamination, syntactical 20—21.

Dative with verbs of asking, demanding, etc. 129—131.

Egeria see Aetheria.

Ellipsis 133—135; of the noun 24—25; of the verb 25—26.

Euphemism 184—193.

Frequentatives in Vulgar Latin 28—29.

Gallicisms 46—47.

Genitive, petrified 135; of identity or inherence 42, n. 4; of price with *valere* 20; elliptical 133—135; inst. of abl. 128; inst. of acc. 128; inst. of dative 126—128; with *audire* 90; with *dominari* 95; with *mirari* 96; with *neglegere* 95; with *obtinere* 95; with *praesidere* 95; with *regnare* 95.

Gerund or gerundive in final sense without *ad* 57.

Gospel of St. Mark, nationality of the author 106—107.

Graecisms 36, n. 3; 43; 51; 78; 88—105; 124; 147; 153; 154.

Gregorius Magnus, style 12—13; 17—18; 30.

Hebraisms 79; 83; 85; 91.
 Hispanisms 41; 45—46; 51, n. 2; 66.
 Infinitive, substantivized 43, n. 1.
 Italianisms 47—48; 49; 50.
 Latin see African Latin and Christian Latin.
 Latin-Greek parallels 28; 110—119; 127, n. 4.
 Latinisms in Greek 25, n. 4; 46; 105—110.
 Loan translations in Latin 78—79; 92; 99—105; in Greek 105—106.
 Mauricius' Strategicon 108—109.
 Mulomedicina Chironis 48—49.
 Nominative, petrified 131—133.
 Nouns see Substantives.
 Novum Testamentum see Gospel.
 Numerals: distributives inst. of cardinals 138—140; distributives inst. of ordinals 140—142.

Oribasius Latinus 49—50.
 Participles see Substantivation.
 Passive, periphrastic 49—50.
 Petronius Arbiter, style 43.
 Pleonasm 21—24; 169; 172; 175—178; of negatives 23—24.
 Prepositions 124—126; 163—175.
 Ruodlieb 56—58.
 Stoic language, parallels with Christian language 73, n. 2.
 Substantivation of pres. participles 122—124.
 Substantives used as adjectives 120—122; used as prepositions 124—126.
 Taboo 181—183.
 Tacitus, *paganus* in T. 77.
 Tmesis 173—175.
 Vernacular influence in Latin 51—58: Celticisms 51; Germanisms 52—58. Cf. also African Latin, Gallicisms, Graecisms, Hispanisms, Italianisms.

Index verborum.

LATIN

ab 164.
ab ante, abante 164; 165.
abintus 165.
ab oculis 101.
absque sine 169.
ad in 170.
ad iuxta 169—170.
ad secundum 170.
adhuc (usque nunc) hactenus 176.
advocare 'comfort' 103—104.
advocatio 103.
advocator 103.
aetas = *annus* 118, n. 2.

aevum = *annus* 118, n. 2; used as adj. 121.
albescere (sc. *die*) 25.
amare refl. 31.
animadvertere 'punish by death' 188—189.
audire with. gen. 90.
barba 'uncle' 34; 51.
Beneventum < *Maleventum* 185.
bonus, constr. 19.
brevis = *parvus* 114.
bucca 'mouth' 27.
caduca (sc. *aegritudo*) 24.
caelum 100; *caelum capitis* 101.

cam(p)sare 48.
campus used as adj. 121.
capit impers. = *capacem esse* 97; = ἐνδέχεται 96; = *fieri potest* 98; with infin. = *potest* 97.
captivus 73, n. 2.
caro opp. *spiritus* 73, n. 2.
charivaria 49, n. 4.
circulus used as adj. 121.
cochlea 27.
coepti with infin. 116.
collis used as adj. 121.
comedere 40—41.
communicare 'profane' 104.
completus adv. 133.
condiscens 122, n. 5.
confessio 78—79.
confessor 78—79.
confiteor 78—79.
conquirere 'discuss' 102.
consilium facere 107.
consolatio 'support' 148—149.
Constantinopolim petrified acc. 137—138.
convallis used as adj. 121.
costa prep. 125.
cum enclitic 172—173.
cum quando 177.
custodia = *custos* 35, n. 2; = 'prisoner' 152.

damnare = *damno afficere* 158.
de 164; 171.
de ab 171.
de ex 171.
deexhortari 171.
deforis 165.
de in antea 165, n. 2.
de inter, deinter 164.
deintus 165.
de latus 125.
demagis 165.
denantea 165.
de post 165; 170.
de retro 164.
descendere 57.

desubitare 33.
de usque 167—169.
dignitas 'dignitary' 153.
dimidia (sc. *pars*) 25.
discens subst. 122—123.
dolus = *dolor* 160—161.
dominari with gen. 95.
dormitio 'bed' 146.
dubitare = *timere* 64.
ducere refl. 30.
dum quando 177.

edere 40; 91.
eicere 27; 115.
eques = *equus* 134, n. 3.
erga 170—171; 172, n. 3.
erga de 170.
erga in 170.
erga secum, etc. 172.
exitus 'grave' 146, n. 2.
exsilire 28.
exstinguere intrans. 62—63.

famosi (sc. *libelli*) 25.

gentes opp. *populus* 74—75.
gentilis 74—75.
gyrus 124.

habens subst. 124.
hactenus usque nunc 176.
hereditas = *heredes* 156.
hostis, f. 'army' 17.

idem unus 22.
idoneus 102—103.
imperium = *imperator* 155.
imprimis 111—112.
in 167; modal with abl. or acc. 'in the form of', 'in the shape of' 34—38; final, predicative 36.
inante 164, n. 1.
inantea 165.
in caput 36.
in gyro (giro) 124—125.

in integrum (*integro*) 166—167.
in primis, in primo 111—112.
in secundis 112, n. 2.
in sic 167.
inter in tmesis 173, n. 3; 174.
interrogare with dat. 129.
in ultimis 112, n. 2.
invocare pro 'call for' 55, n. 2.
irritare = *irritum facere* 159.
ita 'thereupon' 47, n. 1.
ita sic 175—176.
ita taliter 176.
iterare = *iter facere* 161.
iudicium = *κρίσις* 92.
iustitia = *iudex* 152.

labor 'field', 'corn' 147—148.
laccum 'lack', 'defect' 52.
lacha 'lake' 52.
latus prep. 125.
laudare 'promise', 'vow' 57, n. 4.
legare pro 'send for' 55.
levare = *concitare* 36, n. 4.
litus prep. 125.
longanimis, longanimitas 105.
longe, longius = *procul* 114.
longus = *longinquus* 114.

magis 5; 51, n. 2.
manducare 40—41.
manens subst. 123—124.
mendum = *mendacium* 157.
mentio = *mendacium* 158.
metropolim petrified acc. 138.
milites Christi 77.
ministerium 'servant' 153.
minuta (sc. *pars*) 25.
minutum 107.
mirari with gen. 96.
miser cordia 'support' 149.
missa 81, n. 2.
mittere, culinary term. techn. 32; *mittere ignem* 32; *mittere sibi vestem* 33; *mittere pro* 'send for' 54—55.
morosus 'slow' 158.

nascentia 'tumour' 49.
natalis 'martyr's day of death' 185, n. 3.
natica (sc. *pars*) 25.
Neapolim petrified acc. 138.
nec, neque 178—179.
necare 'drown' 191—194.
necessarius 100.
nedum (= *non solum*) — *sed etiam* 64.
neglegere with gen. 95.
nemo nihil 23.
neque see *nec*.
nimius, constr. 19.
non nemo 23.
non obstante 67.
non solum autem, (sed) et 98—99.
nullus nemo 23.
nullus numquam 23.
numquam nemo 23.

obitus 'grave' 146, n. 2.
obsequium 'train', 'retinue' 153—154.
obstare trans. 29. — See also *non obstante*.
obtinere with gen. 95.
oculus 'fountain' 51; *ab oculis* 101.
officium 'office-holder' 153.
omnis totus 22.
orare 72—74.
oratio 72—74; = 'oratory', 'chapel' 147.
orbare 'blind' 186.
orbis 'blind' 186—187.
osculum pacis 80.
ostare = *obstare* 29.

paganus 75—78.
pala 'shoulder(-blade)' 27.
parabola, parabolare 81—84.
Parisius petrified form 136—137.
parium 17; 30.
pars 'district', 'country' 113.
parvi = *pauci* 47.
pax 80—81.
per intensive proclitic 174.
per ante 164, n. 2.
perdere intrans. 62.
per ex 169.

per gyrum (giram) 124—125.
periclitare, periclitari 157.
periculum = *interitus* 157.
peritus in 56.
perniciosa (sc. *aegritudo*) 25.
per ter 85—87.
petere with dat. 129.
pinnaculum 100.
plicare, plecure (se) 45—46.
plus 5.
plus minus 118; 119, n. 3.
populus opp. *gentes* 74—75.
post = *postquam* 47.
potentia 'crutch' 150.
potestas 'one who has authority' 154.
praesidere with gen. 95.
precari with dat. 130.
primis = *in primis* 112, n. 2.
primus 'excellent' 46.
prindere = *prendere* 50.
prior adv. 132.
pro 54—55.
prode 175.
proicere 28.
punire = *morte punire* 187—188.

quaerere with dat. 129—130; with *ad* and acc. 130.

quare 179.
que enclitic 177—178.
quia 179—180.
quia cum (quando) 177.
quies 'grave', 'lair' 146—147.

radicina (sc. *pars*?) 25.
recidiva (sc. *aegritudo*) 24.
rectus adv. 132.
refrigerare, refrigerium 79—80.
regnare with gen. 95.
regnum = *rex* 155; = *corona* 155.
residere = *esse* 65.
rogare with dat. 130; with *ad* and acc. 130.
rogus 'request' 160.
rostrum 'mouth' 27.

sanguinentus 49.
sedere 53; = *esse* 65—66.
sic 'after that' 47; 'yes' 66—67.
sic ita 176.
sic taliter 176.
silere with infin. 20.
solacium 'help', 'support' 148—149.
solum, solus tantum 22—23.
spatula 'shoulder(-blade)' 27.
stagnum used as adj. 120—121.
stare = *esse* 53—54.
subindium 'often' 50.
subire montem et sim. 46.
subitare 33.
suffrago 'knee-joint' 49.
suventium 'often' 50.

talis, gen. talius 17.
tam — *et* 21.
tam — *nec non et* 21.
tam — *seu (et)* 21.
tam — *vel* 21.
tempus = *annus* 117.
testa 'head' 26.
testimonium = *testis* 151—152.
thius, thia 'uncle', aunt' 51.
totus omnis 22.
toti = *omnes* 115.
transgredi 56.
transire 57.
Turonus petrified form 136—137.
tutare 'extinguish' 189—191.

unus idem 22.
utilis 102—103.
utilitas 102.
utiliter 103.
vadere 56—57.
valentia 'assistance' 63, n. 4.
valere = *prodesse* 63; with abl. or gen. of price 20.
varicus adv. 132.
vel 178; = *et* 21, n. 3.

venire pro 'come for' 55, n. 2.
verbum 92.
vestigium = *pes* 117.
vetula 35, n. 5.
virgulta 45; 49.

virtus 'miracle', 'army' 150—151.
vitalia 'shroud' 185.
vitalis lectus 'bier' 185.
vivit Dominus, quia (or *quod*) 84—85.
voluntarius adv. 132.

ROMANCE

Old and Modern French.

s'aimer 31.
ainsi 167.
avant 164.
aveugle 101.
bonace 186.
car 179.
chandeleur 135.
châtain 122.
chétif 73, n. 2.
chez 126.
consolateur 149.
console 148—149.
daintiers 151.
dehors 165.
deintié 151.
derrière 164.
dès 171.
desoter 33.
deuil 161.
doter, douter 65.
en 37.
en chef 36, n. 5.
errant 161.
errer 161.
esteindre 63.
faire faire quelque chose à quelqu'un et
sim. 131.
jusque 167—169.
labour 148.

leur 128.
lez 125.
manant 124.
mensonge 158.
mettre, culinary term. techn. 32; *mettre le*
feu à 32; *mettre un habit* 33.
miséricorde 149.
nache 25.
noyer 192.
orb 187.
ôter 29.
par 174.
parler, parole 51.
perdere 62.
potence 150.
prêche 147.
premiers 132.
pourquoi 180.
prier 130.
querre 130.
rover 130.
ruef 160.
si, dire que si 66—67.
témoin 151.
tuer 189—191.
valeir 63.
vertu 150.
violet 122.
volontiers 132.

Old and Modern Provençal.

calendar, calendor 135.
candelor 135.
costa 125.
denhtat 151.
desoptar 33.
labrar 148.
latz 125.
lavorar 148.
lieis 128.

manen 124.
martror 135.
negar 192.
orp 187.
ostar 29.
paraula, paraular 81.
pasco clauso 135, n. 2; *pascor* 135.
pec 122.
vertut 150.

Old and Modern Italian.

annegare 192.
attutare, attutire 190.
avanti 164.
avvocare, avvocatore 104.
barba, barbas 34; 51.
bonaccia 186.
castagno 122.
cattivo 73, n. 2.
con meco, etc. 172.
confessione 79.
consolle 148.
costa 125.
da 171.
descentre, desent 123.
dietro 164.
difuori 165.
dignitade (Old Lomb.) 151.
dinanzi 165.
dischente (Sard.) 123.

d'oltre 165, n. 1.
duolo 161.
fondo 122.
laore (Logud.) 148.
lavure (Calabr.) 148.
lori (Campid.) 148.
loro 128.
meco, etc. 173.
menzogna 158.
non ostante 67.
orbo 187.
paio 29.
parlare, parola 81.
podestà 154.
prode 175.
rità (Old Venet.) 156.
seco 173, n. 1.
sollanto 23.
zio, zia 51.

Old and Modern Spanish.

abogar 104.
a cas 126.
acedo 122.
anegar 192.
caber see *no cabe, si cabe*.

connigo, etc. 172.
consola 148.
costa (Catalan) 125.
demás 165.
de por 170.

dueño 161.
hondo 122.
justicia 152.
labor 148.
lince 122.
no cabe 97—98.
parte 113.

per de 170.
ruego 160.
si cabe 98.
soplar (Catalan) 34.
tío, tia 51.
virtos 151.
vive Dios, que 85.

GREEK

ἀντικένσῳ 109.
 ἄρχομαι with infin. 116.
 βραγύς 'small' 114.
 δηπενδεύειν 109.
 δηφενσίων, δηφένσῳ 109.
 ἔθνη opp. λαός 75.
 ἐκβάλλειν = ἐξάγειν 28; 115.
 ἐκσφουγγεύειν 108.
 ἐν πρῶτοις 112—113.
 ἐξομολογεῖσθαι 78—79.
 ἐξουσία 154.
 θεῖος 51.
 ἵχνος 'foot' 116—117.
 καλάνδαι 108.
 κακτάτωρ 109.
 κομμενταρήσιος, κομμενταρίσιος 108.
 κούρσῳ 109.
 λεπτόν 107.
 μακρός 'remote' 114.
 μανδᾶτον 109.

μέρος 'district', 'country' 113.
 μουνάτσα 186.
 νοβίσκουμ Δέους 109.
 ὅλοι = πάντες 115.
 οὐρανίσκος, οὐρανός 100.
 παγανός 76, n. 6.
 παραβολή 82—83.
 πεδᾶν 28.
 πλέον ἔλαττον 118—119.
 πληκεύειν 46.
 πουβλικίζειν 109.
 προσευχή 147.
 πρωτεῖον 151, n. 2.
 σαγιττοβολή 109.
 σήκρητον 108.
 τάξις 153.
 ὑπουργία 154.
 φάμουσον, φαμῶσον 25.
 φοσσᾶτον 109.
 χρόνος 'year' 117—118.

Index locorum.

Actus Petri c. Simone
 28 85
Aeneas Silvius (Pius II)
 De lib. educ. p. 184, 5 NELSON ... 19, n. 1
Aetheria
 Peregr. 9, 4 46
 19, 10 47

Ammianus Marcellinus
 XXXI 16, 8 22
Anecdota Rhet.
 p. 42S RÖHDE 22
Apuleius
 Met. VI 29 35

- Bellum Hispaniense**
17, 3 74
- Caesar**
Bell. Gall. VIII 20, 1 118
- Commodianus**
Instr. I 30, 9 62
II 18, 15 29
- Cosmographia**
II 1 (p. 90, 14 RIESE) 22
- Epiphanius**
Interpr. ev.
p. 146, 14 ERIKSON 96, n. 2.
- Firmicus Maternus**
Math. III 3, 14 33
- Gregorius Magnus**
Dial. III 7 63
Ep. II 32 17
II 33 17
- Historia Apollonii**
44 (p. 98, 12 RIESE) 188, n. 1
- Horatius**
Carm. III 30, 12 95
- Hyginus**
Fab. 8 157, n. 4
- Irenaeus**
V 27, 1 (II, p. 398, 3 HARVEY) .. 91
- Iustinus**
II 11, 7 90, n. 2
- Leo**
Alexanderroman
p. 76, 12 PFISTER 57, n. 4
- Liber de viris illustribus**
40, 4 187
- Martialis**
VIII 45, 4 140, n. 3
- Nepotianus**
8, 5 (p. 603, 10 KEMPF) 107
- Octavia**
611 146, n. 2
- Orientius**
Carm. minora III 108
(p. 248 ELLIS) 29
- Orosius**
Hist. adv. pag. I, prol. 9 76
- Ovidius**
Her. 9, 46 (48) 140, n. 3
- Panegyrici**
VII (VI) 1, 1
(p. 220, 21 BAEHRENS²) 155
- Papyri lat.**
Pap. dipl. MARINI
no. 130, p. 195 166
» 130, p. 196 166
- Plinius maior**
Nat. hist. XI 135 101
- Plinius minor**
Ep. VIII 14, 19 188
VIII 14, 21 188
- Propertius**
IV 1, 88 114, n. 1
- Prudentius**
C. Symm. I 449 76
I 619 76
Perist. X 296 76
X 1009 76
- Quintilianus**
Decl. min. 270 188, n. 1
- Tacitus**
Ann. IV 40 151, n. 4
Hist. III 24 77
- Terentius**
Hec. 522 30, n. 5
- Vergilius**
Aen. XI 126 96
- Vulgata**
Marc. 3, 6 107
12, 42 107
Luc. 12, 59 107
21, 2 107